THEOLOGY

VOL. LV DECEMBER, 1952 No. 390

The Welfare State from a Christian Point of View

"THE Welfare State" is an expression which we all now use as a matter of course. We assume that we know what we mean by it, until someone asks exactly what we *do* mean by it. It is an expression that has come into use quite recently—within the last ten years, I suppose; but it does not follow that the thing it is intended to designate has come into existence equally recently. It might be a new name for something that existed previously. So far as I know, no one has yet tried to discover who first used the expression, and when, and why. Providence may be reserving that piece of research for some future graduate on the look-out for a topic for an academic thesis. Leaving that investigation aside, I begin by asking what are the distinguishing characteristics of what has come to be called "The Welfare State"—that is, the characteristics that distinguish it from other kinds of State.

Every kind of State, every form of civil government, in some measure looks after the welfare of its citizens, if only by the provision of law and order. According to the *laissez-faire* school, which was dominant in the earlier part of the nineteenth century, the function of government ought to be kept down to the minimum that was consistent with public security. The best possible government was the least possible government. Government should do no more than hold the ring so as to enable the free play of natural forces and of individual competition to produce a happy harmony. A symbol of the unobtrusiveness of government in the nineteenth century may be seen in Walter Bagehot's remark in 1867 that "so well is our Government concealed that if you tell a cabman to drive to Downing Street he will most likely never have heard of it":[1] a remark which certainly could not be made of the taxi-driver to-day.

The transition from the *laissez-faire* kind of State to what we have now was gradual and piecemeal, in the English manner; it was not the result of an ideological conversion or of a sudden revolution. It was the effect more of economic and political pressures than of disinterested social idealism, though both were at work. But the process was so haphazard that many Englishmen went on for a long time, as some do to this day, professing a simple faith in *laissez-faire* without realizing how in practice they themselves take for granted a whole complex of institutions and services which are quite incompatible with the political faith they profess.

This was pointed out seventy years ago by Sidney Webb in a passage which illustrates the difficulty of determining when and where the Welfare State began. Webb was dealing with the case of the

[1] Quoted in E. E. Reynolds, *Ourselves and the Community* (1935), p. 249.

typical individualist who says "Self-help, sir, individual self-help, that's what has made our city what it is."

> The individualist town councillor (Webb pointed out) will walk along the municipal pavement, lit by municipal light and cleansed by municipal brooms with municipal water, and seeing, by the municipal clock in the municipal market, that he is too early to meet his children coming from the municipal school, hard by the county lunatic asylum and the municipal hospital, will use the national telegraph system to tell them not to walk through the municipal park, but to come by the municipal tramway, to meet him in the municipal reading-room, by the municipal museum, art-gallery, and library, where he intends to consult some of the national publications in order to prepare his next speech in the municipal town-hall in favour of the nationalization of canals and the increase of Government control over the railway system.[1]

That was written in the 1880s. The process of providing for the public welfare by State action and regulation, whether through central or local government, went steadily on. Notable developments were the first provision of old age pensions in 1908, the first National Health Insurance Act in 1911, the establishment of the Ministry of Health in 1919, unemployment insurance in 1920, and so on. *The Times* newspaper has spoken of the Welfare State as the creation of the Asquith government before the first world war. In 1929 Sir George Newman said that to build a healthy race had become one of the primary objects of government. So far as etymology goes, Britain might at that time have been described as a Welfare State. How then does what we have had since the second world war so differ from what we had previously as to justify the use of this new name?

The answer seems to be that in three respects the second world war led to developments in the State's provision for the welfare of its citizens which were so considerable in degree as almost to constitute a difference in kind and to warrant a new name. First, there was a tremendous increase in the amount of expenditure on the social services. Whereas in 1900 the total annual cost of the social services was £36 millions and in 1939 it was £450 millions, in 1949 it was £1,800 millions: or, to put it differently, the annual cost of the social services per head of the population was in 1900 £1, in 1939 £9 14s., and in 1949 £36 14s.[2] Secondly, the post-war reconstruction included an unprecedented attempt on the State's part to co-ordinate and unify, as well as to expand, services which had hitherto grown up in piecemeal fashion, so that the social services invited a single comprehensive name as they had not done before. Thirdly, the nation as a whole and both the political parties are now agreed, as was not the case before, that the State must be so organized as to secure certain basic standards of living and health and opportunity for every citizen. The Welfare State has become the object of a national mystique: and it would be an affectation any longer to pretend that the god to which we have erected an altar is unknown.

As for a formal definition, I accept that of Miss Penelope Hall in

[1] See Mark Abrams, *The Welfare State: its nature and some of its problems* (1951), p. 5.

[2] Abrams, op. cit., pp. 6 f.

her recent and most enlightening book, *The Social Services of Modern England* (p. 303):

> The distinguishing characteristic of the Welfare State is the assumption by the community, acting through the State, of the responsibility for providing the means whereby all its members can reach minimum standards of health, economic security and civilized living, and can share according to their capacity in its social and cultural heritage.

I confess that until I read Miss Hall's book I had not realized how comprehensive and complex is the range and variety of the provisions that are now made for the welfare of all citizens in this country and in particular for all kinds of misfortune and disability. By and large all that legislation can do has now been done: the machinery, the institutions, required to actualize the Welfare State so defined are there. If the provisions that have been made by legislation are not actually or fully in operation, that is owing to deficiency in the number or quality of personnel in the social services, or to the need for more time for legislation to take effect or bear fruit, or to economic obstacles consequent upon the international situation. Undoubtedly there is very much yet to be done if the purpose of existing legislation is to be achieved. "Highfalutin phrases about social medicine are all very well," said a school medical officer in 1948; "we in Salford still have the school lavatories to attend to."[1] But the framework, the structure of the Welfare State, is there and needs only to be filled in as well, of course, as to be modified in detail in the light of experience. It should therefore be possible to form at any rate a provisional opinion from a Christian point of view (or from any other for that matter) about the merits of the enterprise to which this country has committed itself, and also about its limitations and about the drawbacks or dangers which commonly attend even the best enterprises in this world.[2]

Perhaps it should be said at the outset that no one ought to claim that the Welfare State is the final norm or standard of what a State should be according to the Law of God. By the State, in this context, I mean the body politic as organized for civil rule and government. God has not ordained any particular form of State as a permanent or universal pattern: he has left it to political philosophers to do that, and happily we are not tied to their prescriptions. The Bible exhibits for our contemplation, with more or less equal complacency and reservation, everything from the simplest forms of patriarchal and tribal government to the vast cosmopolitan structure of the Roman Empire. The form or structure of a State is to be judged not by any abstract norm or doctrinaire ideal, but by whether in practice it provides a human society first with what is necessary for its existence and then with what is conducive to its well-being.

The maintenance of internal order and defence against external

[1] See Hall, op. cit., pp. 303 f.

[2] Since this article was written, *The Church and the Artisan Today* by Roger Lloyd (Longmans, 4s. 6d.) has been published. This book contains three useful and discriminating chapters on the Welfare State from a Christian point of view.

enemies are necessary for the existence of every society and therefore they are a universal function of every kind of civil government. Beyond that, it is the testimony of the law and the prophets in the Bible that a national community ought so to order its common life that the rapacity of the powerful is curbed and that the human needs of all its members, and indeed of the strangers within the gates, are met. But the extent to which these needs can be met depends naturally upon the resources that are available to this nation or that; and the manner in which they can best be met—whether by direct action or regulation on the part of the civil government or otherwise—varies according to the size, complexity, economic development, and traditional habits of any given State.

I shall return to this point in a moment from a rather different angle. For another way of reaching a Christian point of view on the Welfare State is to reflect upon the divine command "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself", and upon Christ's answer to the question "Who is my neighbour?", and further upon the issue of Christ's work and the gift of his Spirit—namely, the creation of a new kind of community in which men of all classes and races are bound together by grace in a relationship of mutual love which is open to limitless expansion.[1] This new creation, of which only the first instalments are apparent yet, contains the promise that mankind is to become—in the end, at the last Day—a universal family, and can now be moving in that direction. There will be, there is already, a community in which like the limbs of a body all the members share a common life. It is such a common life—in Christ—which is the destiny that God has prepared for mankind.

No earthly State is qualified to realize fully a common life of that kind: the Church itself realizes it only in an exceedingly ambiguous way—"as having nothing and yet possessing everything". At the same time the common life in the body of Christ, now that it has emerged in history, has become a norm or standard by which every human society, whether Church or State, must be tested and to which it should seek to approximate in whatever ways and to whatever degree it can. In some respects every State will always contradict society as re-created by Christ, and must belong to the old world and not to the new—for example, by its use of coercion. On the other hand, those elements of the common life which belong to the sphere of the State are not impervious to the new creation, and the State may be the means by which men may realize here and now some genuine approximation to membership one of another in the body of Christ. But the form which such approximation can best take depends

[1] In an article on "Problème et mystère du progrès humain" in the Sept.-Oct. 1952 number of *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* Père E. Rideau, S.J., writes: "Ouverte par la Résurrection du Christ, l'ère chrétienne est caracterisée par l'espérance . . . par l'*ouverture* de l'avenir, la possibilité de jaillissements, de surgissements et de reprises. Rien n'est absolument définitif et clos, les cercles où la conscience individuelle et collective voudrait s'enfermer sont fragiles et se brisent: l'esprit de renouvellement et d'invention travaille, en toute domaine, l'humanité. La grâce n'est qu'un autre nom de cette espérance, lorsqu'elle manifeste plus visiblement la présence active de l'Esprit de charité."

on the size, complexity, and economic development and traditional habits of each particular State.

If then it should be the case that, in our historic circumstances, the "Welfare State" is the best means by which the human needs of all citizens can be met—by which as a national community we can be assisted to love our neighbours as ourselves (justice is love operating at a distance)—and by which we can best approximate to certain elements of the common life in the body of Christ, then we could say that the Welfare State—however, and from whatever motives, it has come into existence—is from the Christian point of view in accordance with both the Law of God and the Gospel of Christ.

There is still the question whether the Welfare State really is the best or most effective means by which these aims can be realized in our historic circumstances. The justification of the Welfare State in this connexion becomes apparent when we contrast "an agricultural society made up of close-knit and almost self-contained family groups living in isolated communities, each responsible for the care of its own poor and unfortunate", and "a highly industrialized urban society"[1] such as we have now. In the former case the provision by a central government of a complex of social services would have been impracticable and superfluous. The care of the needy and unfortunate could satisfactorily be left, not indeed to the operation of natural forces, but to the traditional *mores* which bound the members of families and local communities to one another in mutual care, loyalty, and responsibility. And in Christendom there was in addition in most localities a monastery or similar institution which provided for those who were not cared for by their own family.

In a highly industrialized age, on the other hand, the family is no longer self-contained or self-dependent; and resources are available which make possible a more adequate and a more equal provision for human needs throughout a whole State with its many millions of population. Further, in this kind of society we are all physically interdependent as we were not before, and this fact requires that we should recognize and make effective a corresponding degree of moral interdependency. It seems inevitable that in this kind of society—with its mobility, cosmopolitanism, and its tendency to deracination—traditional *mores* and the constraint of custom lose much of their authority and power. They need, to say the least, to be complemented by the constraint of legislation, and by the provision of machinery and institutions which will enable—and if necessary compel—men to care for one another, as well as for themselves, to an extent and on a scale that was impossible under the older conditions. Thus President Truman was justified in saying recently that the opponents of a national health service in the U.S.A. "wanted to go back to the horse and buggy days".[2]

Therefore I conclude that Christians ought to welcome and approve the general idea of the Welfare State. But, when that has been said, there are in the first place still a good many open questions about how the general idea can best be worked out from where

[1] Hall, op. cit., p. 4.

[2] See *The Times* newspaper, 17 September 1952.

we are at present and how its provisions can be both improved and safeguarded from abuse. And, in the second place, while we may agree that the Welfare State is a good thing, it is not everything, and it may get in the way of other good things, so that a Christian will accompany his Yes with a No. If it is important to see why we should say Yes to the Welfare State, it is also important to see where and how we should say No.

Before enlarging a little on those points I would interject that there are two enormous questions which I say nothing about in this article because, if I broached them at all, I should become involved in inquiries and speculations which would carry me far beyond my present subject. I mean the questions, first, whether on a long view it is going to be possible to provide the population of the world, and of this country in particular, with sufficient food, let alone with other amenities; secondly, whether this country is justified in keeping its own standard of living as high as possible irrespective of the standards of living in other parts of the British Commonwealth or of the world.

Leaving those questions aside as beyond the scope of this article, I come now, first, to what are open questions in the working out of the Welfare State. Some of these are no doubt purely technical, but others are certainly, from a Christian point of view, frontier questions. It is questions of this kind that ought to be engaging the thought and action of Christians. I will mention a few examples. Thus, how far does the viability of the Welfare State depend on there being in citizens generally a much higher degree of consciousness about the nature and aims of society and a keener sense of responsibility for the well-being of the whole community than there have been in the past? This is parallel to the question Middleton Murry often raises[1] about whether our sort of democracy, if it is to work, does not demand a new kind of political consciousness in its citizens. If so, how is it to be evoked? Then there is the question, what are the new tasks that are proper to each of the political parties now that the Welfare State is an accepted fact?[2] Again, the Welfare State by definition is concerned not only to secure physical efficiency but to meet human needs.[3] There is obviously a good deal of room for debate about what human needs are, and which of them are susceptible to the kind of provision the Welfare State can make: this is a question that is especially acute in the sphere of education. Again, several of the social services are handicapped by a shortage of suitably qualified staff.[4] Since what the Welfare State will turn into depends largely on the quality and calibre of the persons who oper-

[1] E.g. in *The Free Society*, pp. 145 f.

[2] See "Some Neglected Aspects of the Welfare State" by Daniel Jenkins in *The Frontier* (October 1952), pp. 387–400.

[3] The word "welfare", says Viscount Samuel, speaking of the Welfare State, must include not only "material comfort" but also "knowledge, and virtue, and personal liberty and self-respect" (*The Spectator*, 12 September 1952).

[4] For example, social case workers (Hall, p. 118), children's homes (ibid., p. 200), the youth employment service (ibid., p. 206), and youth leaders (ibid., p. 231).

ate its services, the question of their recruitment and training should be a matter of great concern, not least to Christians. And since many of the functions which used to be performed by ordained ministers of the Churches will in future be performed by the officers of the Welfare State, the Churches might be showing more enterprise than they are yet in offering training in a lay theology and in a relevant spiritual discipline for all these new pastors of the Lord's people.

There are also open and important questions about what can best be done by central government and what by local government, and again about what can still best be done by voluntary societies, in which of course Christian interests are very closely involved. Voluntary societies, it need hardly be said, do not mean societies of volunteers. Just as the State services depend upon some people doing voluntary work under their auspices, so the voluntary societies may employ salaried professional workers. A voluntary society is defined by the fact that it owes its existence to the initiative and continued support of individuals and groups, and not to the State, but there is no reason why the State should not grant it financial help. It is not difficult to see that there should always be scope for voluntary social work, since this is more free to pioneer with new experiments and to make mistakes, and so perhaps prepare the way for State action. On the other hand, there are some things, like marriage guidance and citizens' advice, that will always be better done by voluntary societies than by direct State action. It is less easy to see how voluntary societies are to survive under present conditions, and some city or town in England might well experiment with something on the lines of the "Community Chests" which are now found in nearly all important centres in the U.S.A. and Canada.[1] More comprehensively, we can say that Christians should be watching, and contributing to, the working out of the Welfare State at every point with certain criteria in mind which do not come easily to all planners. I mean, is this or that provision or method calculated to nourish or cramp personal freedom and responsibility? Will it strengthen or weaken the family as a social institution? Some people are ready to give generalized answers, based on partial experience or even on partial impressions, to questions about how the Welfare State is working out in these respects. None of the answers will be very convincing till a great deal more scientific field-work has been done, in the attempt to find out what are the actual results of the various social services in their effects on personal character and on family life.

Lastly, I said that there are likely to be more general Noes or notes of warning about the Welfare State which Christians may be moved to sound.

However positive our support of the Welfare State, if we thought that the British people were becoming exclusively preoccupied with material security and comfort, if we thought that our national idol was coming to be the idea of a planned society in which everyone will be comfortably off and have to work only moderately hard, in which morals will be easy-going and we shall be tolerant of one

[1] See Hall, op. cit., pp. 292 f.

another's weaknesses—if we thought that, well then, we should have to declare in season and out of season that, while men must have bread to live, they cannot live by bread alone. That, of course, needs to be said, to myself most of all, but it is less clear to me than it is to many Christians that this ought to be the constant theme of our broadcasts to the British people.

Instead of denouncing the materialism of the age, which is a very easy thing to do, Christians would be better occupied in discovering how the evident tendency of the Welfare State to make us all preoccupied with security and cosiness can be effectively balanced by contrary provisions that will keep us aware of our ultimate insecurity except in the hands of our Saviour, and that will prevent our being cushioned against everything in the real world that makes for doubt, tension, struggle, loneliness, eccentricity, and dying to live. There is no need now for Churches to agitate—as they should have done in the nineteenth century—for the introduction of elementary social justice, nor need they any longer seek to compete with the social services on their own ground. Churches should rather be now finding out how within the Welfare State they may become disturbing community centres where things are not made easy but are seen to be difficult, and where the dark and bewildering, as well as the glorious and reassuring, mysteries of existence, of which the Bible is the textbook, are revealed to the imagination of a famished generation.

This means that the Church has a long way to go from where it is at present: not that we need more attacks on utopianism, but we do need many more focal points to which all in whom there are the rudiments of the divine discontents are tempted to gravitate. It means that there will be a more disturbing, haunting quality and power than there is as yet in the visual arts and poetry and music to which the Church seems to be most commonly wedded. It means that the last thing people who go to church will be inclined to say is that it was a very nice service.

A. R. VIDLER.

Christian Optimism : Scott Holland and Contemporary Needs—II

CERTAINLY Holland's Christology could be called kenotic: but his use of the idea of kenosis serves to show how rich and complex as well as hard of definition it is. The reader of his sermons will not find in them any detailed technical discussion of the relation between the Logos in the bosom of the godhead and the Logos incarnate. The kind of theological issues so delicately and subtly canvassed by Bishop Frank Weston in his truly great book *The One Christ* pass by his attention.

But the reader will find three different aspects of the kenotic idea brought sharply to his attention:

(1) In his understanding of civilization and culture, as we have seen, Holland moved a long way from that of his master, T. H. Green. For him the patience and meekness of God were almost iden-

tical with his providence. As we have seen, too, for him the sanction of this view was Christological: and it is a Christology which has a markedly kenotic flavour.

It is no accident that, when he preaches profoundly on culture and civilization in the group of sermons already marked, he shows how far he has moved away from Green: for in them he is bedding down a positive attitude towards the things of this world in a most serious Christology. It was precisely seriousness about Christology that Green's immanentism would not allow him.

We are so accustomed to the accepted superstition concerning the *Lux Mundi* school,[1] that its members were in bondage to Oxford neo-Hegelianism, that we forget that perhaps one of the most important things about them was the zeal they displayed in breaking out of that prison. From Green men like Holland learnt to expose themselves to the whole manifold impact of contemporary culture: admittedly they learnt from him to pierce the contradictions of the associationist theory of knowledge, but what he gave them before all else was a sense of the world as under the providence of God and of the worth of taking seriously its problems and causes. The technical philosophical criticism of Hume and the utilitarians Green offered owed a good deal to the critical philosophy of Kant and the speculation of Hegel: but in impressing on his pupils the stamp of his own character he furnished them less with an introduction to continental speculation and analysis than with an attitude towards the world they lived in. This became part of their whole intellectual and emotional make-up; but so too was their penitence and that which lay behind it. How to fuse together a sense of historical conflicts as capable of mastery, with a knowledge that it is Christ who has "opened the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers", that in him alone the Father has seen the travail of his soul and been satisfied? To these problems Holland turns in these very great sermons, and to them he sketches an answer that comes perhaps more from meditation on the Passion than from familiarity with German and French thought.

Here then we see kenosis as in effect the principle that bids us measure the Logos-Christ by the *Christus-patiens*. Holland is optimistic: but his optimism is the optimism of the man who has made the Cross the measure of his world. If he believes that persuasion is superior to force in being (τῷ ὄντι) as well as a method of dealing with the obstinate, intractable burdens of our human lot, he does so because in Christ's life the ways of God have been revealed to him. Paradoxical though it may seem, he is far less Hegelian than many modern writers on these topics, whose apologia for trust in providence is much more like confidence in an Hegelian "cunning of the idea" (*ruse de l'histoire*) than "in one who has overcome the world".[2]

[1] Even the Bishop of Durham is not immune from this. Cf. his *Maurice and the Problems of Modern Theology* (C.U.P., 1950).

[2] Cf. in justification of this judgment the impressive Hegelian studies of M. Jean Hyppolite, not least his long review of Prof. Georg Lukács' work on the young Hegel in *Études Germaniques* for April-June 1951 and January-April 1952.

(2) Holland's Christology is also one that stresses the antithesis of Crucifixion and Resurrection. The sermons on the Resurrection in *On Behalf of Belief* are famous: but in preaching on the foundation of the Church, again and again he stresses the reality of the divine incognito. For him the hiddenness of Christ's glory is the thing which makes necessary the training of the twelve, their intimate initiation into his secrets. This belongs not simply to the necessary economy of his self-revelation: it lies deep-bedded in the nature of his work. Here again it is the primacy of the *Christus patiens* that is being stressed: but now in a different way. For suffering and glory are shown as correlates: and the context of the Passion is revealed as the way to resurrection and ascension, to the eternal ministry of intercession, and the gift to his own of the Paraclete.

Although Holland's arguments always show his mastery of a truly theological dialectic, it could be justly said against him that he did not clearly perceive the extent to which "eschatology shows us the true historical and cosmic proportions of the Resurrection".[1] Although his sermons on eschatology are vivid and arresting, they are not closely enough linked in thought with his treatment of the Resurrection. The fact remains, however, that his understanding of the latter is most deeply theological, and shows us the incisive penetration of which he is capable, catching in a phrase, "When he rose, his life rose with him", the very heart of the matter. We see Christ incarnate *through* his Resurrection: and this because in his glory his work is consummated and made perpetual. But that work was one which could be done only in concrete particularity and in settings of deepest humiliation.

(3) But finally Holland's Christology is kenotic because he allows its full pressure to be felt by his doctrine of God. He speaks continually, as I have said, of God's pity, his patience, his very meekness: for him the temper of Christian asceticism is determined by the Christian remembrance that God has "honoured" mankind in the Incarnation.

His language here is, if you like, infected by mythology—that is to say it is a product of an obstinate, hardly dissoluble marriage of the metaphysical and the concretely descriptive. He would have accepted the indictment: for a man, who had felt the impact of Green and yet held to his faith, must have measured the preciousness to his articulation of Christian verity of such language. Green was, as I have implied, actually greater as a social theorist than as a metaphysician (indeed, it is interesting that when Holland himself canvasses a philosophical theme, like the limitations of science, his argument is much nearer to James Ward's than to that of his master in the "Greats" school).[2] But the perspective from which his social

[1] R. Mehl in *Ecumenical Review*, April 1952, p. 292. Cf. also H. A. Williams, *Jesus and the Resurrection* (Longmans, 1951).

[2] In a sermon on hope in *Christ and Ecclesiastes* (1888). Ward's famous first series of Gifford Lectures on *Naturalism and Agnosticism* were given at Aberdeen in 1896. When Holland's philosophical temper is under discussion, it is well to remember the influence exerted on him by Butler, to whose *Analogy of Religion* he devoted his impressive Romanes lecture of 1908. Some of his

theory was developed was one from which, for all its professed value as a critique of *laissez-faire*, the abysses of human conflict could be delicately obscured. And therefore Holland knew the theory would not stand. But because he had learnt from Green the preciousness and the wide possibilities of things human, he did not abandon humanism, but sought a profounder and, we may say, a more deeply gentle humanism. Its foundation was laid in the love of God.

Note, I do not say in the fact that God created us, but in something at once more simple and more profound, his love. Hardly a day passes that we are not reminded, if not by high-placed ecclesiastic then by leader-writer in *The Times* or in one of the various organs controlled by Lord Kemsley, of the menace of materialism, of the need of a "return to God", who is the true foundation of our western culture *et tout ça*. But Holland, who cared greatly for our civilization, and is regarded indeed, or was till recently, by the theological *avant-garde* as a "this worldly" type, did not preach so. He took with a simple, penetrating seriousness God's self-revelation as love, as love active, concrete, working. He saw that the coming of Christ broke up indeed the foundation of our little world, our cosmos made to measure presided over by an idol fashioned after the image of our passing idealism. He turned his hearers towards that which was at once most ultimate and most intimate, at once universal and yet concretely particular. We must measure our world by what we know of its source through his self-revelation. He is in a most searching, because most human, way a theologian of revelation: from Green he learnt (as Hort insisted in his Hulsean Lectures that a theologian must always learn somewhere) of the richness and the diversity of things human, but from his master he departs when he sees the ground and the security of those things resting not in themselves but in the being of the Triune God.

Holland preached constantly on texts from the Gospels; for in the life and death of Christ he found that love of God made concrete and accessible. It is not an accident that he would repeatedly expound the feeding miracles; he never let go of the sharp historicity of Jesus of Nazareth. Yet what was made accessible in his compassion remained in its source inaccessible because inexhaustible. It was the love of the Father manifested to men in the mission of his beloved Son, and of the Paraclete who for ever takes the things of that Son and shows them to the Church.

Holland does not learn to speak of the transcendence of God in general terms: for he presents that transcendence as something by which we are apprehended in the Crucified. The movement of his preaching is continually concerned to protect his hearers against the fallacy of conceiving the relation between God and man abstractly. It is often said of the *Lux Mundi* school (indeed its members sometimes described their work so) that they separated the so-called "physical" attributes of God (omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, etc.) from the "moral" (benevolence, mercy, justice): and

wisest *philosophical* words on faith are to be found in the sermon on μαρτυρια in the Fourth Gospel in *Pleas and Claims*.

their critics blame their Kantian inspiration for this metaphysical philistinism. Certainly Kant's austere moralism was important to them, if only as a corrective to Hegelian elision of ethical distinctions. But their Christology rests on a surer foundation than philosophical confusion. In reality they are challenging just that sort of classification of divine attributes and doing so on Christological grounds. What they are protesting against (and Holland's sermons bring this out) is the Church's unconscious *Entmythologisierung* (demythologization) of its message, of its understanding of being and of God. For what matters in the end is that we should see the power, the wisdom, the presence of God in terms of his love and compassion: something that we could never have so seen apart from the Incarnation.

What gives the work of Holland a vital contemporaneity is the extent to which he thrusts this matter upon our attention. If we speak of him as expressing (in Archbishop Temple's phrase) a "Christocentric metaphysic", we have to remember that for him behind Jesus is the Father who sent the Son. His spirituality swings between a Christocentric and a theocentric pole. Perhaps when he is speaking of the *imitatio Christi*, he sometimes forgets the mystery of Christ's relation to his Father, which he himself elsewhere brings out so well in speaking of the Resurrection: we can wish that his sense of eschatology were more flexible and more pervasive.[1] But in the end he sees that our final concern must be with God: the God whom Jesus reveals, but in the same moment discloses as hidden, the one from whose hand he receives the burden of his mission and his hour, whose nature indeed is shown to men in that receptivity[2] of his.

It is here that we find the ultimate sanction of Holland's optimism. I am not saying that he always sees it himself like that: only that when he reasons his case through, as he very often does, he thus wings his way back to the ground of the world in the love of God. And this makes him a teacher for our age as well as for his own.

For we need to be reminded of the ultimate sweetness of things, in a time of wrath to be recalled to mercy, and in a time of violence to be told again of persuasion. We will not be fobbed off by a trivial optimism: we can easily be betrayed into a nihilistic despair. But our greatest teachers are those who remind us that the law of God's being is pity and meekness, although a pity and meekness revealed in the Cross. In those who witness to this God there may be a strange companionship. Thus a thinker like Canon C. E. Raven, with his deep sympathetic understanding of the vast achievement of modern science of nature as well as his personal love of the natural world, may be nearer than he knows to Karl Barth, whose *Dogmatic in Outline*[3] throbs with a kind of ground-bass of joy and hope strangely

[1] Cf. from a Reformed point of view the fusion of eschatology and Christology in Théo Preiss, *La Vie en Christ* (Delachaux et Niestlé, 1951).

[2] Cf. Dr C. H. Dodd's discussion of Philippians II in his recent Bampton Lectures—*Gospel and Law* (C.U.P., 1951). Cf. also von Balthasar's treatment of Jesus' attitude to time in his *Theologie der Geschichte*.

[3] S.C.M. Press, 1949. The great *Dogmatik* is itself fundamentally an optimistic

reminiscent of Holland's own. (British readers are always ready to ignore Barth's radical Christo-centricism, but it remains the axis of his work.) A profound union may bind such men in their insistence that the Christian message of hope for the world shall not be exploited in the interest of abstractions like "western values", but shall be manifested in its wholeness and sweetness as the succour of God's own pity for his own.

It is for the Christian preacher to stand himself in the shadow of the Cross to catch there the music of God's promise, and joy, of his abiding purpose of love there fulfilled. Too often to-day we fob off men and women crying out for a word of hope with an academically precise pessimism, which seems to glory less in the Cross than in the disintegration of human societies and in the coming of despair. We have reached the truly appalling position of pointing to the threat of the atom bomb as an evidence of the disorder of our being and at the same time, like men in a trance, accepting and preparing to follow to the end the way to which such expedients belong, calling it our "western way of life". The Stalinists[1] are quite right to say we welcome our theologies of despair simply because they confirm us in this nightmare refusal of revolt: they are our necessary dope.

But not so did Holland see the ways of God. He saw them otherwise: perhaps more as R. P. Louis Bouyer in his *Le Mystère Pascal*,[2] when he wrote:

> It seems that in the love of God, in the love which is God, there is something which only sin can let us understand. The paradox is bold: but the Church has made it her own in singing on Holy Saturday, *O Felix culpa!* Sin kindles divine wrath. But approached, as it were, across his wrath, God's love is shown us anew: and it is as if we enjoy by his favour a sudden piercing insight into the eternal secrets of his very heart. This is the incomprehensible mystery of the kenosis, of the God who becomes poor to make us rich, who compels himself to feel bodily the blows we inflict on him in order to pardon the infliction. On the Cross the godhead seems to lay itself waste. God the ultimate judge of all the world interposes himself as a screen against his own anger. Better—the Almighty gives himself up to sinners, and they work their will on him. But had the creature never seen this *Deus patiens*, would he ever have understood the limitless self-giving which is the very inner stuff of God's being? So maybe this torrent of fire had to be poured out upon the world that in the floods we should catch some far off echo of the eternal springs.[3]

The very language of the last sentences recalls Scott Holland's eloquence. But more important: the message of hope these words convey is near his own, and it is a message of which our world is in direst need.

D. M. MacKinnon.

(*Concluded.*)

---

work, a point excellently brought out by von Balthasar in his study of Barth (Hegner, 1951).

[1] Cf. the *Modern Quarterly* and the *Daily Worker* (passim).

[2] Op. cit., pp. 338 f. (Eng. Trans. *The Paschal Mystery*, Allen and Unwin, 1952). Bouyer owes something at least here to Serge Bulgakov: *Du Verbe Incarné* (Aubier, 1944). It is interesting to compare his treatment of Kenosis with the treatment of Krupsis by R. P. René Thibaut, S.J., in his valuable *Le Sens de l'homme Dieu* (Museum Lessianum, 1949).

[3] Eng. Trans. *The Paschal Mystery*, p. 233. The translation here given is my own.

Tamar and Mrs Thomas

If filmed, would the story of Tamar pass the censor? She was married, as a child bride we may suppose, to a brute. "Er was wicked in the sight of the Lord. And the Lord slew him" (Gen. 38. 7). Tribal custom allowed the childless widow a way out of her poverty, misery, and shame. But Onan failed disgustingly in his duty (v. 9)—we may perhaps guess at the intensity of Tamar's mental and physical distress. "The thing . . . displeased the Lord: wherefore he slew him also" (v. 10).

Judah had one son left. As was proper, he promised him to Tamar. While the lad grew up she waited, aflame with thwarted instinct. But Judah let her down too (v. 14). And with the crazy cunning of the mentally unbalanced she played her sordid trick (vv. 15 f.). The gossips get going (v. 24)—indeed, no one comes out with any credit from the whole story. And at last, perhaps without regrets, Judah fulfils his obligations to society. "Bring her forth and let her be burnt." And so the brutal dénouement, and what must have been a particularly difficult birth of twins (vv. 27 f.). And Tamar passes out of history—to reappear on the first page of the New Testament.

"The book of the generation of Jesus Christ . . ." (Matt 1. 1). But how shocking, women in a genealogy, and what women! First Tamar, then Ruth. "And when Boaz had eaten and drunk, and his heart was merry, he went to lie down . . . and she came softly and uncovered his feet and laid her down. And it came to pass at midnight that the man was afraid, and turned himself: and behold a woman lay at his feet" (Ruth 3. 7, 8). Let gallant scholars rush to the defence of the Biblical heroine. She was but observing the custom of the time. But to the world at least it must look uncommonly like the seduction of a rich man in drink by a penniless girl. Then "her that had been the wife of Urias" (Matt. 1. 6). What a reminder of the hero David's shame! And then finally the awkward and equivocal "Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ" (Matt. 1. 16). "We be not born of fornication" (John 8. 41), claim the enemies of Christ. The spiteful inference is hardly contradicted by this traditional genealogy. Unless Ruth be acquitted, the three women who precede Mary would appear to have one thing in common: a sordid personal history, which yet finds fulfilment (as it were, against the odds) of the first commandment of God to mankind—first, that is, in the Biblical chronology. "Male and female created he them. And God blessed them and God said unto them, Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth . . ." (Gen. 1. 27). The Lord and Giver of life is present at every crisis of Tamar's life, working triumphantly towards the birth of those twins despite every obstacle which human perversion can put in his way. Charles Simeon used to say that every sermon should exalt the Saviour and humble the sinner. The story of Tamar certainly humbles the sinner. We see a most unflattering picture of human behaviour in the actions of Judah, Er, Onan, the gossips, and Tamar herself. We glimpse too the

suffering which sin brings. And the story exalts the Saviour. Christ is the key to its meaning. Paul was to write to Timothy (1 Tim. 2. 14,15): "The woman being deceived was in the transgression. Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing." When Christ descended to preach to the spirits in hell, were Tamar, Ruth, and the lovely Bathsheba given the grace to hail him as Saviour and Son? This we do know of Tamar. Out of deadly suffering she won through to fulfilment not only of her personal calling to motherhood but also of God's great purpose for that generation.

Now, Mrs Thomas (as we shall call her) is a very different kettle of fish. If Tamar was pathologically over-sexed, Mrs Thomas is as normal as she ought to be. If Tamar was desperately unhappy, Mrs Thomas is placidly contented—she appears so at least, and would certainly never tell a clergyman if she wasn't. Tamar, maybe, is an historical figure. Mrs Thomas is a myth, a representative middle-class housewife, living in a semi-detached villa with her husband and their son Timothy aged eighteen months. Why then have they been brought together? God's purpose and presence in Tamar's life are hidden until Christ comes into the world. God's purpose and presence in the life of Mrs Thomas are hidden until (or unless) Christ comes into her heart and mind. And for each motherhood is (or may be) the clue by which that hidden purpose and presence are (or may be) revealed. Tamar is in the Bible. Our minds are trained to detect God at work in her life, however sordid. Mrs Thomas is not. Our minds are not trained to detect God at work in her life, however trivial. Indeed her detachment from the life of the visible church may tempt us to assume that he is not at work in her.

Each morning Mrs Thomas awakes with a start, abruptly turns off the alarum. At once her thoughts and energies are fixed on two needs—to get her man off to work with breakfast in him, and to dress and feed her child. At breakfast Mr Thomas is irritable. Like thousands of other foolish men, he times it all to the minute. The slightest delay evokes a monstrous grumble. Nor is Timothy patient. He bangs with his spoon, eats greedily, spilling half of it on the floor, upsetting his milk. Mrs Thomas doesn't get a bite till her husband is half-way to the hatstand.

Timothy is soon finished and must go upstairs on his pot while she washes up. Twice he gets off before he has done what is necessary. Up and down stairs she runs and at last he has to be smacked. He must do what is necessary.

That is the stuff of which her daily life is made—and God is present, his purpose is being fulfilled in the situation. We learn from the ministry of Jesus Christ that it is God's will that children should be cherished, that men and women should be healthy. From the moment of waking Mrs Thomas directs her energies towards the maintenance of the health of husband and child. Both must have hot breakfast. Timothy must be smacked if he refuses to make the necessary after-breakfast effort on his pot. Readers may raise their eyebrows at the emphasis given to this last point in what purports to be a serious essay in theology. But the intention is to show God's

presence and purpose in the humblest and most trivial details. To Mrs Thomas the word "spirit" means "spook", not whisky—she is in the wrong income-group and anyway too respectable. For her God is a vague and kindly power controlling the heavens and Christ a wonderful man who lived ages ago. Yet as she patiently and with some efficiency goes about her daily chores, God—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—is present with her, unawares, waiting upon her recognition. "Behold I stand at the door and knock."

Let's skip a few hours—after all, housework can be boring—and imagine the lunch finished and washed up. Timothy is safe in bed for an hour's rest. She must go shopping. The fresh air is good for Timothy. He must be roused, wrapped up warm, and put to chortle in his pram while she gets ready. She powders her nose, deftly touches up her lips, prods a ridiculous little hat into position, and slips snugly into the smart new fitted coat her husband bought her last birthday. It is a brilliant crimson and she feels a queen in it. Is God's purpose present here too? Yes, he wills that she should continue attractive to her husband, to stimulate that passion of which children are born and married life normally sustained. Of course her husband will not see her smartness as she wheels Timothy to the shops. But that smartness will be contributing to the assurance of her femininity and of her power which is such a significant factor in her attractiveness to him.

Enough has been said of her day. There remains her night. D. H. Lawrence was surely right to preach that sexual love should be nocturnal, mysterious, dark. And indeed adequate treatment of this part of the subject demands a more mature, sensitive, and indeed sanctified approach than the present writer feels competent to make. Suffice it to point out that the Book of Common Prayer repeats the apostolic analogy between matrimony and "the mystical union that is betwixt Christ and his Church". The analogy at least extends to the fact that both the marriage union and the union between Christ and his people are deeply personal, intimate, and sensitive relations of love. And both unions in this world are subject to painful tensions occasioned by the self-regarding indiscipline of our individual purposes and desires.

It remains briefly to expose two theological convictions, the one negative, the other positive, which underlie this treatment of the purpose and presence of God. First, then, it is not implied that because Mrs Thomas may be doing God's will in the details of her daily routine she is thereby, as the Bible puts it, saved. In Tamar's life God's will was manifestly fulfilled and at great cost. Yet we cannot say whether she was able to greet the Christ as Son and Saviour at the last. What we can say is that God is present in these two lives at a deeply personal level. A parallel suggests itself in the sacramental presence of Christ in the Holy Communion. It would be widely agreed that that presence is real, objective, purposive, and personal; but that its benefits are appropriated only by faith, even though it be as a grain of mustard seed. So God's presence in the routine of Mrs Thomas is real, objective, purposive, and personal.

But she will benefit only as she is conscious, even a little, of his presence and intends to fulfil his will.

The second conviction is that telling stories, describing situations and events is a proper theological method, perhaps ultimately the proper theological method of approaching the God of the Bible, the living God, active in concrete situations, entering into personal relations. Such stories or situations may be actual or mythical, that is to say, representative. In Christ's parables they are both. The old lady next door lost her savings. After hunting everywhere she found them in the lining of her bedroll—where, of course, she had put them. She just has to have a little party to celebrate. A prodigal has just returned to the next village stony-broke. Everyone is wondering how the old man will take it. Some zealot farmers have murdered their absentee landlord's agents, and now they are for it. And so on. In Christ's parables the Holy Spirit fulfils, confirms, and perfects his own primary method of old. Jeremiah's old woman broke a pot when washing up. Instead of (or as well as) cursing her as he had every right to do, he saw in a flash—that's what God will do to Jerusalem. And he went out and acted his parable. And so must we, if we are to bring Mrs Thomas and thousands like her to conscious conviction of the purpose and presence of God. The kingdom of heaven is like a man playing football, a girl buying a new mac; like going overseas on national service, like opening the office window and letting the fresh air in, like (dangerous ground this) a change of government. Christian theology, like the Lord whom it seeks, must enter into the experience of the common man. For example (and in conclusion):

The kingdom of heaven is like a young shorthand typist who really must get a new mac. Each morning on the way to the office she admires a "smasher", a gorgeous affair in satiny tartan, given pride of place in the window. But of course you need to be pretty hot to wear a thing like that. What would the other girls say? She can't carry it off, they'd think; she could do with something a bit quieter.

And then there's the expense—she could get something less glamorous and just as good for a good bit less; well, she'd have to cut down on fags for a couple of months—that's all.

So at last the thing is done. She slips out of the shop hugging her precious parcel. But it's days before she appears in the office in all her glory.

Or, again, the kingdom of heaven is like her friend in the office who also needs a new mac. One morning she sees what she wants, gets it, and comes out wearing it.

The interpretation? The kingdom is something splendid, infinitely desirable, something we cannot do without. But, we ask, are we good enough? Don't we need to be pretty hot? And what will people think of us? Hypocrites who can't carry it off? And then, it will cost something. We may have to give up quite a bit. We'd better count the cost first. And even then it may be a good time, even a lifetime,

before we really appear what we shall be, glorious in the liberty of the children of God.

And then again for some the kingdom comes in a flash of revelation. They see whom they want and take him into their lives with open arms.

But now look, our young typist is at work in the office. The kingdom of heaven is like someone opening the window on a bright March day. The breeze comes tripping among the files, fluttering the papers. Someone curses. Most of them don't notice. But to one or two it is as the breath of God, bringing the wholesome tang of the sea, as of eternity; bringing the sharp savour of the pinewoods on the slopes of the delectable mountains.

A. H. Dammers.

Justin Martyr and Confirmation—A Note

In his book *The Seal of the Spirit* Mr Lampe writes on page 111: "It is quite likely that Justin may omit to mention ceremonial additions by which the rite of Baptism may have been already embellished." It is the purpose of this note to suggest that Justin was familiar with a ceremonial pattern of Baptism similar to that described by Tertullian, and that this pattern certainly included the use of oil.

In Dialogue 41 Justin says that the offering of the finest wheat flour on behalf of those who are being purified from leprosy is to be regarded as a type of the Eucharist. The reference is to the prescriptions of Lev. 14. Why does Justin, apparently alone of Christian writers, think of Lev. 14 when he thinks about the Eucharist?

It is clear from the context that he is not thinking about the Sunday Eucharist, but about the Baptismal Eucharist. The offering of Lev. 14 was made on behalf of those who were being cleansed from leprosy. The Eucharist, which is its antitype, must therefore be that which is made on behalf of those who are being cleansed from sin; and this cleansing, as we know from Apology 61, Justin believes to be effected in Baptism.

Further, it seems probable from the context that he is thinking of the Paschal Eucharist, with which Baptism was especially associated at least as early as Tertullian's time (*De Baptismo* 19). For in the preceding chapter (Dialogue 40) he is discoursing on the mystery of the Paschal Lamb, which is one of the classical themes of the Paschal celebration at a later date.

Why then does Justin think about Lev. 14 when he thinks about the Paschal Eucharist and its accompanying Baptisms? Presumably because the sequence described in Lev. 14 sufficiently resembled the Baptism-Eucharist sequence with which he was familiar.

The rite described in Lev. 14 reaches its conclusion on the seventh/eighth day. On the seventh day (verse 9) the leper bathes his flesh in water; and on the eighth day (verses 10 and following) he brings three lambs and fine wheat flour and oil to the priest who is responsible for his cleansing. The first lamb is sacrificed, and the

leper is anointed with the blood. The oil is then offered, and with the remainder of the oil the leper is anointed. First, various parts of his body are smeared; and then apparently the oil is poured all over him. "And the rest of the oil that is in the priest's hand he shall put upon the head of him that is cleansed" (verse 18, LXX). Finally, the two other lambs and the sacrifice (i.e. the fine flour) are offered, and the propitiation for the leper is completed (verses 19, 21, LXX).

It is suggested that the similarity between the offering of the fine wheat flour at the climax of the leper's cleansing and the offering of the bread of the Eucharist at the climax of Christian Baptism was not the sole reason for Justin's selection of this type; but that there was a general similarity of pattern between the two rites, which caused Justin to remember the one when he thought about the other. The cleansing of the leper concludes with a seventh/eighth day rite. So the initiation of catechumens concluded with the Saturday/Sunday Paschal celebration. On the seventh day the leper bathes his flesh with water before coming to the Tent of Meeting. So on Saturday the catechumen was baptized, or baptized himself, before being introduced into the Christian assembly (Apology 65). On the eighth day the leper comes to the priest and makes his oblation of lambs and fine wheat flour and oil. So on Sunday (which followed Saturday without a break in the course of the Paschal Vigil) the newly baptized came to the clergy with his oblation of a fine wheaten loaf. (If Hippolytus in *Apostolic Tradition* 21, 9 really wrote: "Let those who are to be baptized not bring anything else except one loaf for the Eucharist", was he forbidding them to bring oil as well as bread?) The leper is then anointed with blood and with oil, first on various parts of the body and then generally by a pouring of oil over the head. So, if the pattern, with the obvious omission of the animal sacrifices, was worked out in the comparison, the newly baptized would be anointed with oil, with a thoroughness which reminds us of the post-baptismal unction described by Tertullian in *De Baptismo* 7. Finally the leper's cleansing reaches its climax in the making of the sin-offering and the burnt-offering and the offering of fine wheat flour. So the newly baptized's initiation reached its climax in the offering of the Eucharist, which is the antitype of the offering of fine wheat flour, and the only sacrifice which God accepts, now that he has rejected the sacrifices and priests of the Old Law (Dialogue 117).

If the suggestion made in this note is correct, it follows that Justin was familiar with an initiatory rite which included Anointing with Oil as well as Baptism with Water and the Offering of the Eucharist. Those who accept Professor Ratcliff's conclusions in his article in THEOLOGY, April 1948, would wish to add to the pattern a Prayer for the Descent of the Spirit of Isa. 11. In that case the initiatory rite known to Justin consisted of Baptism with Water, Anointing with Oil, Prayer for the Descent of the Messianic Spirit and Baptismal Eucharist, and is identical with that known to Tertullian.

Those who are patient enough to try to enter into Justin's mind still further may find a reference to post-baptismal unction in Dia-

logue 86. Here he is dealing with various types of the Cross to be found in the Old Testament, and his mind seems to be playing round the complex of water, faith, and wood, of which he treats later in Dialogue 138, when he is dealing with Noah's Ark. Accordingly the various types are selected mainly for their connexion of wood with water. So we have Moses with his rod dividing the Red Sea and bringing water out of the rock; Moses with a tree sweetening the waters of Marah; Jacob putting rods into the water troughs to make Laban's cattle conceive, and crossing Jordan with a rod in his hand. His mind is running on the connexion between the Cross and Baptism. We are not therefore surprised to find an open reference to Baptism at the end of the chapter: "Even as our Christ, by being crucified on a tree and by purifying (us) with water, has redeemed us, though sunk in the very grave offences which we have committed, and has made us into a house of prayer and worship." But not all the types in Dialogue 86 are of wood and water. For after the five types mentioned above he passes on to Jacob anointing the pillar at Bethel to be a symbol of Christ, and quotes Psalm 45. 7: "Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows", and refers to the anointing of kings and, by implication, of priests. This leads him on to Aaron's rod as a type of the high-priesthood of Christ, and from this he passes to the "rod from the stem of Jesse" of Isa. 11, upon whom, as he is going to expound in the following chapter (Dialogue 87), Isaiah prophesied that the sevenfold Spirit was to rest.

It is suggested therefore that when Justin's mind starts running on Christian Baptism, he begins by thinking about water, and produces Old Testament references of a more or less apposite kind; he then goes on to think about oil, and produces similar references to prefigurations of the anointing of Christ and to the anointing of kings and priests; and he next proceeds to quote from Isa. 11, with an implied reference to the sevenfold Spirit, which the Christ imparts to those who believe in him, as he teaches openly in the following chapter.

But here is the sequence of Baptism with Water, Anointing with Oil, and Imparting of the Spirit, which we find in Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 6, 7, 8.

A. H. Couratin.

"Parish and People"

"Parish and People—oh yes, they're the folk who stake everything on having the cruets at the back of the Church!" Such is an actual judgment made by a priest on the movement about which this article is to be written.

It need hardly be said that it is not a description which would commend itself to those who belong to "Parish and People". Nevertheless it provides a useful point at which to begin an attempt to expound the purpose and aims of this movement, for it is an illustration of how judgments are based on the more superficial

manifestations of this—or any other—association's policy. It probably also is a warning to those enthusiastic, but not the wisest, supporters of "Parish and People" who emphasize methods rather than fundamental principles.

Before embarking on the attempt to set out these principles, it is necessary to say that I am writing of this movement from my own point of view. I do not pretend that my account of it is in any sense "official". Indeed, the origins of "Parish and People" are so diverse that almost any number of its supporters asked to say what they were would probably all give somewhat different versions.

As I see it, two trends of thought and experiment lie behind the movement, and it represents the point at which they intersect. The first had its beginning in the universities and theological colleges.

Those who have read *The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*, Vol. II, by Canon Roger Lloyd, will remember the remarkable chapter he writes on Sir Edwyn Hoskyns's work at Cambridge: "The Scriptures are the Word of God, who has spoken; and the Church is inseparable from the Scriptures. The Church is, therefore, the Divine Society." "This," says Canon Lloyd (p. 57) "in briefest possible form, is what Hoskyns lived to teach."

From one point of view, Hoskyns was in reaction to the Liberal Protestant position. He took that theology at its word. Its basis had been a critical approach to the Bible. In effect, he said, "Very well, let us be thoroughly critical!" He insisted that the Gospels must be understood from within. This meant, as he showed, that they must be understood from within the Church, since they were the writings of the Church.

Anyone who has tried to follow Anglican theology over the last quarter of a century cannot have failed to see how Hoskyns's influence has permeated it through and through. It is clear—to name only two books, themselves of great importance—in Ramsey's *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* and Thornton's *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*. Theology once more has become firmly anchored in the Scriptures, and as a result the doctrine of the Church is seen to be of major importance.

Here it is necessary to pay some attention to wider movements of thought which were influencing the minds of the theologians. During the nineteenth century science made its advance into new fields, particularly biology and organic chemistry. Inevitably, this new knowledge made its impact upon the philosophy of the period, and Lord Russell succinctly reminds us of it when he writes, "The prestige of biology caused men whose thinking was influenced by science to apply biological rather than mechanistic categories to the world. . . . The conception of organism came to be thought the key to both scientific and philosophical explanations of natural laws" (pp. 753–4, *History of Western Philosophy*). In the writings of General Smuts we find this concept of organism carefully worked out. His conclusion of the matter is given in a paper which he read to the British Association in 1931. He said: "A whole is not a sum

of parts, or constituted by its parts. Its nature lies in its constitution more than in its parts. The part in the whole is no longer the same as the part in isolation."

Just as the science of biology provided philosophers with a new "key", so the work of philosophers who were using the "key" influenced the minds of theologians. Hoskyns had already turned their attention to the Bible as the word of God wherein is set forth the nature of the Church as the divine society. They then found that in the Scriptures images were used to convey the truth about Israel, old and new, and these images were nearly always of organisms. All this had happened at the time when, as we have seen, the nature of organism was being investigated both from the side of science and philosophy. No wonder, with the impact of these trends of thought, the nature of the Church shone forth with a clearer light. It was, however, in relation to the doctrine of the Incarnation that the first great synthesis appeared in Fr Thornton's *The Incarnate Lord*. Since then the same writer in his *Common Life in the Body of Christ* has applied it to the doctrine of the Church. Other theologians have done the same, and no words show more clearly than those of Archbishop William Temple how deeply these movements of thought have affected our thinking. He writes: "It is in the Society first, not in its members first, that we must hope to find the abiding witness and energising power of the Gospel."

Alongside these developments in Biblical theology and in philosophical theology there has been a great deal of research into the history of Christian liturgy, and a truer understanding of liturgical principles. Books like *Liturgy and Society* by Fr Hebert, *Strange Victory* by Canon Max Warren, *The Shape of the Liturgy* by the late Dom Gregory Dix, are evidence of this. The general conclusion of these investigations is consonant with the conclusions of Biblical theology and Christian philosophy inasmuch as the liturgy is seen to be the common worship of the people of God which is a divinely constituted organism.

I recognize that this account of intellectual trends is inadequate, but I trust that it serves to remind us of a development which I believe has been gathered up into "Parish and People".

It would be, however, thoroughly misleading to give the impression that the movement is entirely or even mainly intellectual. From another point of view its origins lie in the parishes. There, since the end of the first world war, the Church has been facing a whole series of acute difficulties. Priests have diminished in numbers, finance has been an intolerable burden, a gulf between clergy and the mass of the people has widened, the effects of materialistic philosophies have been working themselves out in the minds of ordinary people, and the all-powerful suggestion of secularism has conditioned men's attitudes. Every parish priest has had to meet all these problems, and others besides. In the face of them experiments have been made. Of these, some are now forgotten, and better so. Others have justified themselves pragmatically. In a number of cases they were made not merely to meet a given situation, but because the intellectual

movements of which I have written had brought parish priests to convictions about the nature and life of the Church.

So it happened that all over the country there came into being services like the "Parish Communion" (but not always called that). Attempts were made to get the local congregation to meet as a whole in the consciousness that it was the Body of Christ in the parish, and to think and pray and act as such. The current method of administering Holy Baptism was called in question, and in some places it came to be performed in the face of the whole congregation. Christian "cells" were formed, and considerable emphasis fell on "Adult Education".

All this developed spontaneously, and, for the most part, as a result of experiments by parish priests who were trying to grapple with their difficulties. In course of time, one priest heard of another's work and efforts were made to meet and exchange views. As far as I am concerned, the first such group I knew centred in Sheffield and produced an occasional paper called *The Leap*. At first, the purpose was practical—to learn from each other how these experiments worked. Then, both by the pressure of logic and the growing dissemination of the intellectual movement to which I have referred, efforts were made to find a theological basis for the experiments. Eventually, it became clear that precisely such a basis was being worked out by the theologians, and that the experiments in the parishes corresponded to a manifestation in local church centres of the theological principles.

Some of us, as I have already said, were meeting from time to time in the north, and in the south others, quite independently, were exercising their minds about the right steps to take. As a result a Conference was called at Queen's College, Birmingham, in 1949, and another at the same place in 1950. It was at the second of these that "it was decided to create an association which would link together and extend the various manifestations of new life". The association styled itself "Parish and People" and described its purpose as follows: "for the study and dissemination of the principles underlying the Church's corporate worship (i.e. the Liturgy), and for the application of these principles in the life of the parish and in the world (liturgical action)." The official leaflet of "Parish and People" formulated the main concerns as: (i) The Theology of the Bible. (ii) The Christian Community. (iii) Liturgical Worship. (iv) The Church and Society.

Since then the movement has gained considerable strength. A conference was held in Liverpool in 1951 on "The Lord's Day" which was notable both for a masterly survey of the subject by the Rev. F. J. Taylor and for the enthusiasm of about 150 priests. Not only had the movement gathered into itself theologians—in the sense of students of the Bible—as well as parish priests, but it also had amongst its leaders liturgical scholars like Fr Hebert of Kelham and the Bishop of Knaresborough, who was its president.

All this life found expression in an even larger conference at Oxford in 1952. There, Professor Michael Ramsey, the Rev. Gordon

Phillips, and Miss Batten, of the William Temple College, were the speakers on the general subject, "The People of God". So great has become the demand for places at future conferences that the movement now has to plan for regional gatherings to supplement the national one.

Details about its conferences, periodical and other activities can be obtained from the Rev. Kenneth Packard, Fenny Compton Rectory, Leamington, who is its secretary.

In my view "Parish and People" by this time represents an influence in the life of the Anglican communion as powerful as any that exists. It is a point of growth within the Church at a time when the Church appears to be in retreat in the eyes of many people. (*a*) It has gathered into itself the work of theologians, of liturgical scholars, and the aspirations of many parish priests. It thus represents a return to a theological basis for the life and work of the Church. A true relationship between the academic theologian and the parish priest is being established. The parish priest sees that the work of the theologian is of vital importance to him, and the theologian views with great interest and concern the experiments which are being made in the parishes. (*b*) The movement holds within itself those who would call themselves Anglo-Catholics, and those who are proud to be styled Evangelicals as well as many who refuse any label. These varying traditions of churchmanship within the context of "Parish and People" are more and more seen to contain elements which are complementary, and it may well be that the movement is heir to the treasures of both the Evangelical and Catholic revivals. (*c*) The principles underlying the Church's corporate worship, which find their expression in the liturgy, are closely studied both for their own sake and in order that they may be applied in the life of the parish and in the world through liturgical action. Here again we see that Christian sociology is not an extra concern only for those specially interested in it, but arises out of the theology, the liturgy, and the parochial work of the Church.

For these reasons many of us have come to believe that with prayer, with zeal, and with humility "Parish and People" can be a means whereby God the Holy Ghost can infuse new life into the Church of this day.

R. Nelson.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr MacKinnon is Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Aberdeen.

The Rev. A. H. Dammers is a Lecturer at the Queen's College, Birmingham.

The Rev. A. H. Couratin is Principal of St Stephen's House, Oxford.

The Rev. R. Nelson is Rector of Liverpool.

CORRESPONDENCE

"KERYGMA"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The remark in your October editorial on the use of this term by Forsyth prompts the suggestion that it was used at Marburg long before it appeared in the teaching of P. T. Forsyth and Professor C. H. Dodd. Those who read the *History of Dogma* at the university long years ago may recall that this term is one of the key words of Harnack's Ritschlian thesis; but, unlike Professor Dodd, he contrasts *kerygma* not with *didache* but with *paradosis*, to the detriment of the latter.

SEDGEBERROW RECTORY,
EVESHAM.

Yours faithfully,
W. E. J. LINDFIELD.

"ETHICAL AND RELIGIOUS CLASSICS"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

In THEOLOGY of October 1952, p. 399, the reviewer of the *Mystics of Spain*, by E. Allison Peers (*Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West*, No. 5), while highly praising the contribution under review, writes: "The idea behind the present series of Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West is a dubious one and seems calculated to produce little more than the polished eclecticism which will accept the more lofty and attractive tenets of any religion so long as it remains totally committed to none." Having the privilege of knowing something of the men who originated the series and of their intentions, I beg to be allowed to saw that such an assertion does not correspond to the facts and is not substantiated by the previous volumes of the series (*Rumi*, by R. A. Nicholson; *Sufism*, by A. J. Arberry; *Lipo*, by A. Waley; *St Francis in Italian Painting*, by G. Kaftal). The purpose of the series, the editors of which are A. J. Arberry, S. Radhakrishnan, H. N. Spalding, and F. W. Thomas, is "to place the chief ethical and religious masterpieces of the world, both Christian and non-Christian, within easy reach of the intelligent reader who is not an expert" and has no access to the sources. This is a contribution to the history of mysticism—i.e. to an objective and comparative science which does not claim to solve theological or metaphysical problems. The general introduction reproduced in all the volumes of the series clearly emphasizes the two following points: "The great religions differ in fundamental respects. . . . There is an enormous amount of common ground in the great religions, concerning too the most fundamental matters." The contributors to the series try objectively to assess both these fundamental differences and these fundamental agreements and do not

attempt any easy syncretism. From the religious standpoint it might be said that those whose religion is dogmatic will not find it without profit to acquire some knowledge of other teachings, first because these other teachings are so often misrepresented and misunderstood, and secondly because the comparison of the diverse approaches sometimes proves spiritually enriching. We should not be more exclusive than the Greek Fathers, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, who so generously acknowledged their debt to the *platonici* or to Aristotle; nor than a Jesuit writer, Fr J. Maréchal, who, considering in a positive sense the "problems of mystical grace in Islam" (*Studies in the Psychology of the Mystics*, Engl. transl. by A. Thorold, Burns Oates, 1927, p. 279), speaks of the "unexpected perspectives" opened by L. Massignon's researches on Al Hallaj and says of Hinduism, Buddhism, and Islam: "Would it not be worth the trouble to seek more attentively than ever, with exact science and wholly evangelical charity, for the 'stepping stones' which God has probably provided by his grace in these vast religious milieux?"

I, am, Sir, your obedient servant,

ST BASIL'S HOUSE, LONDON. ARCHIMANDRITE LEV GILLET.
10 *October* 1952.

"THE EXTENSION OF THE INCARNATION"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

I wish to express thanks to several of your readers who kindly replied to my query about "the extension of the incarnation", which was published in the July number of THEOLOGY. My question related particularly to the application of this phrase to the Church, and from the information which I have received it appears that the credit must be given to Bishop Gore; at all events, the earliest instance which has been brought to my notice is in Gore's Bampton Lectures, *The Incarnation of the Son of God*, 1891, p. 219: "The Church is the Body of Christ. It is the extension and perpetuation of the Incarnation in the world." It is true that the thought is found in earlier writers (e.g. Möhler, *Symbolik*, 1832, p. 332 f.), but Gore appears to have been the first to use the actual phrase.

This inquiry, however, has uncovered a mystery regarding the origin of the phrase in its original application to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper or Eucharist. In his later book, *The Body of Christ*, 1901, Gore cites the phrase in this reference and in a note he refers to Thomassin: ". . . Thomassin, a theologian who has the widest and profoundest knowledge of the Fathers, can find no other phrase to summarize his massive quotations from them on the subject, than by speaking of the Eucharist as 'the extension of incarnation'—the instrument for extending the incarnate life." Gore's reference is to the tenth book of Thomassin's, *Dogmata Theologica* (Paris, 1680–9). Chapters 21 and 22 of that book are superscribed *Ecclesia tota Eucharistiae sacrificio implicatur et immolatur, quia Eucharistia extensio quaedam est et propagatio incarnationis* (Chapter 22 omits

et propagatio), and consist of lengthy catenas of quotations from the Greek and Latin fathers, in none of which, however, does the phrase actually occur. It appears to have been Gore's view that Thomassin was the originator of the phrase.

This, however, cannot be the case, since the phrase was already known to Jeremy Taylor: 'The Fathers by an elegant expression called the Blessed Sacrament 'the extension of the Incarnation' " (*The Worthy Communicant*, 1660; Works, ed. Heber, vol. XV, p. 420). Now the phrase is frequently found in *modern expositions* of the eucharistic doctrine of certain early fathers, especially Gregory of Nyssa and Hilary of Poitiers (e.g. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, II, p. 454, and Bethune-Baker, *Early History of Christian Doctrine*, p. 425), but I have been unable to find it in any of the passages cited. One correspondent cites an obscure reference from an anonymous seventeenth-century French work to Augustine *On The Psalms*, but the phrase is not given in the Benedictine Index to Augustine.

Where did Jeremy Taylor find it?

Princeton Theological Seminary,
Princeton, New Jersey.
3 *October* 1952.

Yours sincerely,
George S. Hendry.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Seal of the Spirit. A Study in the Doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation in the New Testament and the Fathers. By G. W. Lampe. Longmans. 35s.

For close upon four centuries the ancient Hebrew inquiry "What mean ye by this service?" has been addressed by the Puritans and their successors to Anglicans in regard to the rite of Confirmation and its relation to Baptism. The Anglicans have never been agreed as touching what they should answer. When some have answered definitely in one sense or another, their answer has promptly been pronounced by others to be unsatisfactory. Some fifty years ago, the views of Dr A. J. Mason were contested by Dr A. T. Wirgman. More recently, Dom Gregory Dix and Fr Thornton have been controverted by a variety of opponents, including the Bishop of Derby. An opinion on the matter, expressed several years ago by the Bishop of Oxford, provoked Mr Lampe's strong dissent. The book before us is Mr Lampe's contribution to the controversy.

His investigation necessarily begins with a consideration of the evidence afforded by the New Testament documents. After a chapter on "The Pauline conception of sealing and its antecedents", in which Mr Lampe's great lexicographical learning makes his study of the terms *sphragis, sphragizein*, of particular interest and value, he proceeds to discuss the baptism of John, the baptism of Jesus, and the baptismal practice and beliefs of the apostolic Church. Mr Lampe is conscious, of course, of the diversity exhibited or suggested by the documents: for example, while he holds that the true inter-

pretation of the earliest, the Marcan, account of Jesus's baptism must associate the descent of the Spirit with the moment of Jesus's ascent from the water, he is prepared to admit a possibility that "the Matthaean and Lucan accounts might perhaps represent an early dissociation in the Church's theology of Spirit-baptism from the water-baptism with which it had originally been united". Again, Mr Lampe is aware of inconsistencies in the narratives of Acts. Here, however, the systematic theologian in him is uppermost; he refuses to accept the inconsistencies as being other than "apparent" or "supposed". He holds that water-baptism, conceived as the external sign of Spirit-baptism, was the regular form of initiation in the period with which Acts is concerned. He therefore rejects attempts to treat as evidence for a complement of water-baptism, or Confirmation, those passages of Acts in which the Spirit appears to be conferred by a laying-on of hands. Following Dom Gregory Dix, he believes those passages to be connected "with some kind of 'ordination' or with something akin to ordination, at least in certain respects". The kind of ordination here contemplated has as its purpose "the furtherance of the Church's world-wide mission", which, in the mind of the author of Acts as Mr Lampe reads him, is "the Spirit's primary work". Whether this or any other be the true interpretation of the debated passages, only their author himself could decide; but if Mr Lampe be right, his interpretation would suggest the relatively early adoption of hand-laying, employed, if not actually as an "external sign", yet as a precatory and benedictory gesture, in those communities in which, after the Matthaean and Lucan traditions, Spirit-baptism was not identified with water-baptism. Mr Lampe admits it to be possible that Heb. 6. 2 may be witness to a hand-laying of this description, but in want of other New Testament reference he thinks that the usage (if, indeed, it be the subject of allusion here) "may have been employed in a local church without becoming widely accepted". Mr Lampe also takes notice of the suggestions, advanced by Dr T. W. Manson, to the effect that the New Testament documents reveal traces of a doctrine of the pre-baptismal bestowal of the Spirit and that the early initiatory practice of the Syrian Church represents a survival of this tradition. Mr. Lampe considers the evidence for this theory to be too insecure to justify either of Dr Manson's views. In the end, therefore, Mr Lampe would have us be persuaded that water-baptism, regarded as complete in itself, is the one form of initiation which can properly claim the sanction of the New Testament, and that an essentially Pauline interpretation of water-baptism in terms of the inward seal is the one type of doctrine to be properly described as "*The* New Testament Doctrine" (the italics are the reviewer's).

To many of Mr Lampe's readers, his treatment of the New Testament evidence will seem to be an over-simplification. The simplification once accepted, the ensuing task is proportionately simplified; "the New Testament doctrine" and the practice which it interprets become a regulative standard, and the author's task is, in the main, to explain and to note the stages of both the "disintegration" of the

doctrine and divergence from the practice. If, on the other hand, the simplification be regarded as mistaken, and the diversity and inconsistencies of the New Testament material be taken as they stand, his readers will look to their author to perform a somewhat different task; they will expect him to trace and account for the emergence or development, out of the primitive variety in practice and doctrine, of the several baptismal rites, and in particular of the Baptism-Confirmation type of rite which attains its classical form in the Roman Sacramentaries and their Byzantine equivalents, and the disintegration of which in the West has bequeathed a troubled legacy to the Anglicans. According to this view of the matter, liturgical usages, wherever they can be ascertained, and the settled rites themselves possess, for the patristic period, an importance distinct from that of the theological treatise or the Biblical commentary, because they embody the official or accepted traditions of the Churches using them; and also because, by means of what the rites prescribed to be said and done, the initiates were made directly aware of the nature and implications of their initiation.

Though Mr Lampe chooses the former of these alternatives, it must not be supposed that he omits to take notice of the liturgical evidence. He does so: yet he sometimes entangles *liturgica* with *theologica*, so that the significance of the *liturgica* is obscured, or at least is not thrown into due relief. The rite of the Gelasian Sacramentary suffers from this method. Its connexion with the liturgical arrangements attested by Cornelius, and earlier by Tertullian, is not made clear; and the piecemeal treatment of the rite is hardly satisfactory. The mass of material with which Mr Lampe has to deal is inevitably difficult to handle; nevertheless, though he handles it with skill, it would have been more convenient for his readers had he kept the Greeks, the Latins, the Syrians, and the others distinct from each other, and in this way had enabled himself to exhibit the "succession" of their liturgical and theological traditions. Incidentally, with regard to Tertullian, in stating that "The importance attached to the imposition of hands at Baptism by such authors as Tertullian is *directly* [again the italics are the reviewer's] due to their reading of Acts", Mr Lampe presses Tertullian's references farther than they will reasonably take him. At a later stage of his argument, Mr Lampe slightly modifies his view. He also discerns in Tertullian's theology "a real confusion": "We can only suppose either that he distinguishes between the regenerating activity of the Holy Spirit and his personal indwelling [a distinction which Mason held to be true but which seems to differentiate unwarrantably and unintelligibly between these modes of the Spirit's activity], or that he thinks of the gift bestowed by the laying-on of the hand as a charisma different from, and additional to, the Spirit's indwelling in the soul—something corresponding to the 'grace for service' of the *Apostolic Tradition* [though Tertullian does not say anything of the kind]—or we must admit that he is confused and misled by his interpretation of Acts and by the Old Testament allusion with which he seeks to support his theory." In a writer so voluminous as Tertullian, it would be

surprising if we were to find complete consistency; yet there can hardly be doubt that he would plead guilty to the first of Mr Lampe's alternatives, and that he would be puzzled by Mr Lampe's adverbs, "unwarrantably" and "unintelligibly". It must also be said that he would undoubtedly be puzzled by the subsequent Western practice of separating Confirmation from Baptism. His thought moves within a unity of rite.

A word must be said about Mr Lampe's reference to *Apostolic Tradition*. The Greek text underlying the Verona Latin version of the Confirmation Prayer in *Apostolic Tradition* lacks a petition for the bestowal of the Spirit upon those who, a moment previously, have received baptism and the first anointing. The prayer is, as Mr Lampe describes it, one for "grace for service". Dom Gregory Dix held that the Verona Latin version was corrupt, and proposed to restore what he believed to be the purposive petition of the prayer in the form, "make them worthy to be filled with thy Holy Spirit", which he derived from the equivalent prayer in the Syriac *Testamentum Domini*. Mainly on palaeographical grounds, Mr Lampe sets aside the authority of the *Testamentum* here, and takes the Verona Latin version as an uncorrupted rendering of the Greek of Hippolytus. Hippolytus would therefore be a witness against the Baptism-Confirmation type of rite described by Tertullian. There is, however, in the Confirmation Prayer of *Testamentum Domini* a striking echo of Hippolytus's *In Danielem* I, xvi, a passage in which Hippolytus interprets Susanna's bath as prefiguring Christian initiation, the soap (*smēgmata*) symbolizing the Commandments of the Logos, and the oil (*elaion*) representing the powers of the Spirit, " with which after the bath believers are anointed as with ointment (*muron*)". Whether Hippolytus's own rite was in all respects identical with Tertullian's could be said only if we had before us the text of *Apostolic Tradition* as Hippolytus left it; and there are reasons for thinking that we have not. Nevertheless, as far as his remains indicate, Hippolytus appears to have conceived the powers of the Spirit as being bestowed, not at the moment of the baptismal "bath", but after it.

Mr Lampe offers his readers so much that it would sound ungracious to ask for more. Yet the present reviewer, for one, could wish that he had added a chapter on the ideas connoted by the terms *pneuma* and *spiritus* within the period of his survey, and had considered the possible bearing upon his subject of the statements of those writers whose distinction between Logos and Spirit is not clearly defined. Again, the reviewer cannot but regret that the exigencies of the present internal Anglican controversy over Confirmation appear often to be in the background of Mr Lampe's contemplation of the past, and sometimes to shape his judgments upon it. For some of his readers, perhaps, the practical aspect of his study will be the most interesting. For Mr Lampe himself the practical aspect is not secondary. He is concerned to deprecate any doctrine of initiation which cannot be stated in terms of "the New Testament doctrine" of his early chapters, and which would make confirmation an

obligatory complement to Baptism or an indispensable prerequisite to reunion.

It remains only to say that the student of ancient Christian thought need not be discouraged by these practical interests. He will know how to discount them; and he will find in Mr Lampe's book a wide learning, a wealth of information, and an abundance of suggestion, which will amplify, enrich, and stimulate his own study in this field.

CAMBRIDGE. EDWARD C. RATCLIFF.

THE CHRISTIAN DILEMMA: CATHOLIC CHURCH—REFORMATION. By W. H. van de Pol. Authorized translation by G. van Hall. J. M. Dent and Sons. 21s.

From time to time there are published successors to Newman's *Apologia*. In 1937 the author of this one attended the Edinburgh Conference on Faith and Order as a representative of the Reformed Church of the Netherlands. Newman was concerned to justify the Church of Rome as against the Church of England; Dr van de Pol considers it in relation to all the churches of non-Roman Christendom as these are associated together in the Ecumenical Movement and the World Council of Churches. His thesis is that sooner or later all Christians and all churches will realize that they have to choose between Roman Catholicism and Reformed Christianity. Orthodox and Old Catholics will discover that they are really Roman Catholics in schism, and will take the action proper to the discovery. Anglicans will be unable to continue sitting on the fence and will have to decide on which side to get down.

To establish his thesis Dr van de Pol compares the Reformed with the Catholic conception of the nature, content, and foundation of faith. For the Catholic, to be a Christian means to be living as a member of the earthly body of Christ, sacramentally united here and now to his Lord. For the Protestant it means living as a justified sinner waiting for the fulfilment of God's promise when the Lord shall return at the end of time. So far there is nothing in the contrast which need necessarily produce Dr van de Pol's dilemma. In England the chief exponent of "realized eschatology" has been a Congregationalist theologian, and the forthcoming report of the Lund Faith and Order Conference will show how belief in the Church as the mystical body of Christ is finding itself at home in Reformed circles. Nor in themselves do the contrasts described in the chapters on psychological factors and the relation of the Church to the world justify the use of the word "hopeless" in the Introduction. The underlying ground for insisting on the dilemma is to be found in the conception of revelation.

Dr van de Pol's treatment of this subject is open to two criticisms: (i) Like too many other theologians, both Catholic and Reformed, he is not content to accept the kind of revelation which God has thought fit to give his creatures, but assumes that his Creator must provide him with one that measures up to his own specifications.

(ii) These specifications demand the authoritative communication of information in such detail that his words about Protestants are applicable to himself: he "cannot separate the immutable, essential element depending on Christ alone from the changeable, accidental element deriving from man". Those who can make this discrimination, and have a creaturely willingness to be content with the revelation their Creator has thought good for them, will not despair of the time coming when the Church of Rome shall see the error of many of its present ways, when it will no longer be necessary for the van de Pols of the future to renounce the Reformation in order to be in communion with Rome, or for a similar decision to be made by those many others who pass from communion with Rome to communion with Canterbury.

In his account of Anglicanism great stress is laid on our alleged claim to comprehensiveness. I have argued in these pages (August 1940) that we should do better to think in terms of fertility, that the Christian Church, united by holding in common to "the immutable, essential element depending on Christ alone", should rejoice to see this fertile in the production of varied types of Christian life and worship. Dr van de Pol's book makes it clear that the fundamental problem for the unity of Christendom is that of the accurate determination of this "immutable, essential element". When agreement is reached on this, the dilemma will cease to exist.

Oxford. Leonard Hodgson.

The Christian Society. By Stephen Neill. Nisbet. 17s. 6d.

Messrs Nisbet and Co. are to be congratulated upon producing a book of 334 pages at the comparatively cheap price of 17s. 6d. But they deserve our commiseration upon their blurb writer, who in the course of 200 words manages to give a completely false impression of the book and write one quite long sentence which is pure cotton-wool ("All this, and therefore this work, would have been impossible without a wide and deep knowledge of the forces which have led, and still are leading, congregations of faithful men to play a predominant part in the field of spiritual endeavour." Who else except congregations of faithful men ever did whatever this appalling circumlocution means?). The book is *not* "a close study of the factors which . . . have maintained the essential continuity of Christianity". A *close* study of this subject would demand a book at least three times as long as this, and if this book has a fault it is that it gives an impression of skimming over some periods and movements in Christian history, where the reader would prefer a deeper study. The author's "personal allegiance" is *not* "unmistakable", and he does *not* pay "no more attention than can be helped to dogmatic considerations". Greatly to the author's credit, the book reeks with dogma, the dogma of the Incarnation, and the dogma of the Holy Spirit's indwelling in the Church.

The book is in fact a rather loose running commentary upon the way Christianity has worked, or failed to work, in the various socie-

ties which it has encountered from its first beginnings to the present day. It is not a work of profound scholarship, though the author has obviously read very widely and his judgment must command great respect. It is essentially a record of the personal opinions concerning Christian history of one whose personal opinions are very well worth having, not the fruits of careful research. It is a rather prosaic, usefully down-to-earth version of Charles Williams's *The Descent of the Dove*, more accurate, more factual than his book, and certainly not less valuable.

Bishop Neill is peculiarly well equipped to write such a work. He has been a bishop in India, and has seen Christianity living in an environment completely free from any of the inherited advantages or difficulties of the English scene. His remarks about the characteristics of Christianity under Muslim rule (pp. 71–83) are particularly interesting. The author is also an officer of the World Council of Churches and appropriately manages to impart to his interpretation a genuinely ecumenical tone. That is to say, though he deals faithfully and revealingly with Anglicanism (especially on pp. 303–6), he is just as fair in his account of other traditions; he apparently possesses a remarkable detachment which cuts across denominational divisions without underestimating them. His observations upon the controversial but unavoidable subject of the Church of South India are in keeping with the high standard of the rest of the work (pp. 307–10).

In short, this is a most useful and a most stimulating book, not so much for the student of church history or of the history of dogma as for the ordinary parish priest. It should make him ask himself the right questions and enable him to lift his view above the preoccupations and distractions of parochial life and begin to see steadily and whole the Christianity which he preaches. We would urge all readers of THEOLOGY to divert their Rural Deanery Chapters for a space from discussing such absorbing topics as the provision of Prayer Books in the local mortuary chapel and whether marriages are to be solemnized in Lent, and call their attention to the importance of reading and studying this book.

We have noted a few misprints: p. 52 (n), *labonaret*; p. 62 (n), *Osktirche*; p. 90 (n), *elle-mmêe*; p. 122, *Grosseeste*, p. 180, *just* (for justly); p. 219, *pilgimage*; p. 286 (n), *infautile*. And we cannot believe that it was in *1454* that Pope Nicholas V divided the newly discovered lands between Spain and Portugal.

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM. R. P. C. HANSON.

THE UNITY OF GOD. By Percy Hartill. Mowbray. 16s.

In one of his "Ego's" James Agate says that, amongst other things, the function of dramatic criticism is to answer the questions, What is the (new) play about? and, Is it good, bad, or indifferent? Our task is to try to answer the same questions in relation to Archdeacon Hartill's new book, *The Unity of God*.

What is it about?

The author sets himself three tasks: to expound the Christian doctrine of the Unity of God, to show how the Unity of God has been a controlling principle in the development of other doctrines, and to show how other aspects of thought can be tested by reference to this basic doctrine.

Beginning with a rapid sketch of six types of theistic belief and asserting that it was Jewish monotheism unaffected by Greek thought which formed the starting-point of Christian thinking about the nature of God, he considers first the problem which the *fact* of the historic Jesus created for monotheism. That Jesus was a fake, or merely a good man, or an *avatar*, are each shown to be an hypothesis either contrary to plain evidence or inconsistent with monotheism. The only conclusion consistent at once with monotheism and the *fact* of Jesus is the conclusion, Jesus is God. Then, after a very useful chapter on the doctrine of the Logos, he shows how divine Unity was not only normative in the establishing of Christological doctrine, but has also shaped the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and determined our thinking in the matter of relations within the Godhead.

In the light of this emphasis on the Unity of God he examines our belief that God is "without body, parts, or passions", and considers various types of Atonement theory. He then goes on, in what is perhaps the most interesting chapter in the book, to use the Unity of God as a norm against which to test the validity of theories on the Unity of the Church. And then, almost as an example of how to use a fundamental theological doctrine to examine the value of theories which lie partly outside the realm of theology proper, the book concludes with a critical examination, in the light of the full implications of Christian monotheism, of Bergson's *Les Deux Sources de la Morale et de la Religion* and Lindsay's *The Two Moralities.*

Is the book good, bad, or indifferent?

Excellent. It does what it sets out to do, and does so unpretentiously and with a simplicity which, in relation to the subject matter, represents a considerable achievement. It is not a rehash of ill-digested material.

Of course, if one must be critical, it was remarked to the writer of this notice—in relation to one theologian who is criticized by Archdeacon Hartill in his chapter on "The Unity of the Church"—"that he might have brought his big guns out against somebody who really *had* a theory of the Church instead of against ——!" But is this really criticism?

There is, incidentally, a chapter which alone should commend this book to theological students, on "The Terminology of Trinitarian Doctrine", in which the original use and developed meaning of terms like *οὐσία, ὑπόστασις, πρόσωπον, essentia, substantia,* and *persona,* are lucidly set forth.

The book is eminently readable and clergymen might well try to make it available to those thoughtful laymen who browse round the "Non-fiction: Philosophy and Religion" shelves of our public libraries, by asking the librarian to put it there.

One last word. For those who think the appearance of a book important—and who doesn't—Mowbrays have done well. Good paper, clear print, and plain but attractive binding.

R. Tatlock.

London.

Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession. By Marcus L. Loane. Lutterworth Press. 12s. 6d.

It was said of Canon Loane's earlier book, *Oxford and the Evangelical Succession*, that the title was misleading, as two of the five studies were not of Oxford men. This criticism cannot be made of his new book. The five men of whom he writes here were all educated at Cambridge, and four of them exercised a considerable influence over Cambridge undergraduates at some time in their ministry, Berridge and Venn from their parsonages at Everton and Yelling, and Simeon and Martyn as resident Fellows of their colleges and as Vicar and Curate respectively of Holy Trinity Church.

The essays on Grimshaw and Simeon are good, though unoriginal both in subject-matter and interpretation; that on Henry Venn is useful, but inaccurate here and there; those on Berridge and Martyn are distinctly poor. Canon Loane shows how as preachers they did speak home to men. "If you perish," said Grimshaw, "you perish with the sound of the Gospel in your lugs" (p. 32). The essay on Berridge, however, is flat and repetitive, and though there are instances of his wit and eccentricity, we miss Canon Smyth's picture of the fat, jolly parson, who keeps a barrel of ale in his house so that his visitors' ears might be more open to his religious instructions. Although several of Whittingham's anecdotes have been included, the best one is not here: Soon after Berridge had become a regular preacher at Whitefield's Tabernacle, a lady came from London to Everton to ask Berridge to marry her, saying that the Lord had revealed it to her that she was to be his wife. "Madam," replied Berridge, "if the Lord has revealed it to you that you are to be my wife, surely he would also have revealed it to me that I was designed to be your husband; but as no such revelation has been made to me, I cannot comply with your wishes."

Canon Loane's earlier book was useful, because there is little that is easily accessible on Cecil, Scott, and Daniel Wilson, but there are good books, ancient and modern, on all these men. Canon Charles Smyth's *Simeon and Church Order* contains brilliant portraits of Simeon, Berridge, and Henry Venn. Constance Padwick's *Henry Martyn* is a classic, and George Cragg's *Grimshaw of Haworth* is not as well known as it ought to be. Canon Max Warren's essay on *Charles Simeon* contains much new material and an interesting interpretation. Of the older books Carus and Moule on Simeon are readable and informative, so are Whittingham's edition of *Berridge's Works* and H. Venn's *Life of the Revd Henry Venn*. There are plenty of quotations from nearly all these works, which may well whet the reader's appetite for the books themselves. The letters of Berridge

and Venn are specially worthy of attention; they abound in wit, charm, and good English, and are packed with spiritual counsel.

Canon Loane, quoting Bishop Ryle, criticizes the style of Venn's own book, *The Complete Duty of Man*, as "neither sparkling, nor racy, nor pithy, nor anecdotal, nor pictorial" (p. 137). In fact, Venn's style is more sparkling and pithy than Bishop Ryle's, or for that matter Canon Loane's, which belongs to Ryle's century rather than ours (the final essay on Martyn, for instance, is completely marred by sentimentality). Although the modern reader might be advised to take *The Complete Duty* in small doses, the devotional appendix is of rare excellence, particularly the *Prayer to be used before partaking of the Lord's Supper* and the *Prayer for a Student educating for Holy Orders.*

It is unfortunate that Canon Loane sets such store by Ryle's *Christian Leaders* and *The Life and Times of Selina, Countess of Huntingdon*—both of which overstress the extra-parochial ministries of the Evangelicals. This gives a false balance. Too much space, for example, is devoted to Venn's preaching tours, while there is no mention of the twenty-two candidates for the ministry who came forward while he was at Huddersfield, and who, because of the absence of ordination funds, were trained as Nonconformists. Nor is there any mention of the Elland Society which Henry Venn formed and which eventually rectified this state of affairs. Too much importance is placed on Venn's relationship with Whitefield, not enough on his friendship with other Yorkshire Evangelicals. Nor is Venn's relationship with Wesley and the Huddersfield Methodists properly handled; the agreement mentioned on page 141 soon broke down.

In spite of these criticisms this book will prove a good introduction for any unfamiliar with the lives of these five men and will do something to satisfy the growing interest in the early Evangelicals which is manifest among undergraduates and theological college students.

Michael Hennell.

St Aidan's College,
Birkenhead.

Society and the Homosexual. By Gordon Westwood. Gollancz. 9s. 6d.

Those who followed the discussion of homosexuality in the January and February numbers of Theology will need no further introduction to the subject of Mr Westwood's timely and interesting book. More and more it is being recognized that genuine inversion is not, in the words of Dr Edward Glover, who writes the Introduction, "the lecherous perversion of self-indulgent degenerates", and that the homosexual is a psychically sick person who is penalized legally and socially for a condition which he cannot help. Both the Christian conscience and enlightened public opinion demand a change of attitude towards the invert, and the removal of the legal injustices which threaten him. But this cannot be accomplished without education, and under the guidance of Mr Westwood a great deal

of ignorance and error should be dispelled. He has written a simple, non-technical account of the causes and treatment of inversion, its legal and social aspects, the levels of homosexual society, and the personality of the invert, which ought to be read by every clergyman, doctor, magistrate, and judge. With such a book now available, there is no longer any excuse for the crude misrepresentations of homosexuality which have for so long been current, and the distinction between inversion and perversion should be clear.

Mr Westwood's remarks on the cause of inversion are particularly important at a time when the sitting of the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce has focused attention upon marriage breakdown: ". . . a straightforward, unprejudiced, secure family life is the finest insurance against the development of homosexual tendencies . . . a large number of homosexuals come from maladjusted parents and broken homes". He also criticizes the sexual segregation of the adolescent, and it is clear that there is very much to be said for the benefits of co-education and the association of boys and girls in clubs and organizations in promoting a healthy heterosexual adjustment. Among the other important points he makes are the small part that homosexual seduction plays in establishing a condition of inversion, and the fact that much of the violent denunciation of homosexuality which is heard, for example, from the bench is in reality due to guilt complex and "represents a desperate repudiation of [the person's] own homosexual tendencies".

With some of Mr Westwood's views there will be disagreement. In particular, the theologian will note that there is no discussion of the problems of inversion from the standpoint of morality. There are cursory references to Christian ideas of sex and to the attitude of the Church, which "tends to regard sex as a mechanical, easily controlled process and any sign of deviation from the set standard as a heinous sin". This remark alone shows how far Mr Westwood is from an understanding of the Christian view, as does his observation that "'right' and 'wrong' become meaningless when we compare one civilization with another". His book would have gained in weight and usefulness had he attempted a serious discussion of the moral issues to which homosexuality inevitably gives rise. It is unfortunate, too, that he restricts his study to male inversion, for although female inversion does not produce the same social and legal problems, it is just as important where personal adjustment is concerned, and is actually part of the same problem. It is surprising to find in the bibliography no mention of that important study, *The Invert*, by "Anomaly"; and it would have been an advantage to have the page references of the quotations made. There are a few irritating solecisms (e.g. "meet up with") and errors of statement (e.g. "Dr Keale, Headmaster of Westminster" for "Dr Keate, Headmaster of Eton"); but these do not greatly detract from the value of a book which, it is to be hoped, will be widely and sympathetically read.

SHERWIN BAILEY.

BIRMINGHAM.

SHORTER NOTICES

The Fundamental Questions of Philosophy. By A. C. Ewing. Routledge and Kegan Paul. 18s.

This book joins the growing list of introductions to the study of philosophy, and is more competent and comprehensive than most. It is intended for university students who are just beginning a course in the subject, and for the interested layman who wants some initiation into these mysteries. The method chosen by the author is a straightforward systematic exposition of the great questions (including God), consideration of which has constituted philosophy as an academic discipline, at any rate down to 1939. As such the book is judicious, fair, compact, acutely and courteously argued, an excellent summary of the main stock-in-trade of argument and counter-argument. Pleasant, if rare, touches of wit are to be found ("Heat a piece of iron red-hot, then put your hand on it, and note carefully what you feel", p. 101). There is no attempt to provide a historical picture, nor is any indication given to the beginner where he may find one. (He had better follow up this book by dipping into Russell's *History of Western Philosophy*.) Footnotes are kept to the minimum, and a concise and well-chosen bibliography is provided at the end.

Basil S. Moss.

St Catharine's,
Cumberland Lodge,
Windsor Great Park.

The Authorship of the Fourth Gospel. By H. P. V. Nunn. Alden and Blackwell. 7s. 6d.

The Christ of the New Testament. By A. W. Argyle. Carey Kingsgate Press. 10s. 6d.

New Testament Literature. By T. Henshaw. George Allen and Unwin. 25s.

Most modern works of scholarship are studiously, not to say obsequiously, polite. Mr Nunn's book is undisguisedly pugnacious. Its main purpose is to examine the external evidence for the authorship of the Fourth Gospel. There is never a dull moment. First Mr Nunn spears the critics on John 21. 24 and displays them wriggling. After the consideration of the evidence of John 19. 35 and 1 John there follows a comparatively subdued chapter summarizing the evidence from early Christian literature and a more detailed consideration of the evidence of Irenaeus. Streeter, von Hügel, J. N. Sanders, Vincent Taylor and Dr Burney are mordantly criticized. Finally three special points are singled out: (i) John the Elder's "reality is not beyond question, and his importance is nothing more than the invention of critics in search of an author". (2) The Alogoi denied apostolic authorship chiefly because of the discrepant order of events. (3) The supposed evidence for the early martyrdom of the Apostle John is wholly inadequate.

The last third of this little book is given to the consideration of Internal Evidence. The conclusion is that we only think the Gospel could not have been written by a Galilean fisherman if we suppose him unchanged by contact with God Incarnate—in a Galilean carpenter.

The value of Mr Nunn's book lies in its protest against "academic terrorism". He shows that if we deny apostolic authorship we must do so in the face of the external evidence, which is at least independent of our own presuppositions. The difficulty which Mr Nunn does not face is that the external evidence supports strongly the apostle's authorship of the Apocalypse. It is much easier to feel confident that the author of the Apocalypse did not write the Gospel than that the son of Zebedee could not have written either. And if the external evidence misleads once, why not twice?

Here many old battles are refought. But it is done with great zest—and with some of the disorderliness of the battlefield.

In *The Christ of the New Testament* Mr Argyle aims to demonstrate the unity of the New Testament witness to the divinity of Christ by establishing, first, that Jesus claimed to be divine, and, secondly, that the Birth, Death, Resurrection, and Exaltation, of Jesus have a "Divine Significance". He is very thorough-going. "The Nicene and Chalcedonian statements of our Lord's divinity do not add anything to the original apostolic preaching" (p. 16).

It is fashionable to draw out the implicit Christology of the Synoptics, but there is a strain of neo-fundamentalism in some of the chosen examples. "In Matthew 25. 31–46 the exalted and glorified Son of Man is identified with the King who conducts the Last Judgment; and 'King' is an Old Testament title for God" (p. 59). Argument by cross-reference is perilous, because it cannot be consistently applied and depends on the certainty that we have the *ipsissima verba Christi*. Nevertheless the argument of this first part of the book is valuable. It reminds us that even in the Synoptic accounts Jesus claims a unique relationship with the Father. Whether therefore Jesus thought of himself as very God cannot be immediately decided. The Enochian Son of Man is supernatural; is he therefore divine?

The second part of the book does not do quite what it seems to attempt. We expect it to show that the New Testament interpretation of the Birth, Death, Resurrection, and Exaltation, of Jesus is intelligible only if Christ is God. That is (inevitably) the theme of the chapter on the Incarnation. Thereafter it becomes obscured. So the death of Jesus is considered as Ransom, Victory, Sacrifice, and Penalty, but not as the declaration of God's love and forgiveness (Rom. 5. 8). The Resurrection is described primarily as the Father's act (which is true but no evidence of the divinity of Jesus) instead of as the willed action of Christ himself—the unusual teaching of John 2. 19 and 10. 18. The Exaltation is emphasized in its priestly and soteriological aspect, rather than as the historical sign of Christ's eternal status, his natural heavenliness, if we may so interpret the words *ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ* of the *varia lectio* of John 3. 13. Above all

there is no consideration of what the indwelling of the "Spirit of Jesus" (Acts 16. 7) implies about his perfect Godhead.

New Testament Literature is a useful and readable compendium, well fulfilling its purpose of collecting "the relevant historical facts and the main theories of the different theological schools" for the use of non-specialist students. Each book of the New Testament is considered under such headings as Authorship, Contents, Purpose, and Historical Value. Possible criticisms are that Mr Henshaw tends to overstress the non-theological character of the Synoptics; that he belittles the originality of the Johannine theology ("the author borrows most of his main conceptions from Paul"); that he omits to mention the work of Dr Carrington and Dean Selwyn on the common catechetical and liturgical sources underlying the Epistles; and that he is superficial in his treatment of the teaching of "Hebrews" and does not mention Nairne's hypothesis concerning its origin. He is happiest when characterizing the writings of Luke; and useful in setting out the evidence that the Apocalypse is a pastiche of Old Testament phrases and ideas.

SUTTON-IN-ASHFIELD. GRAHAM NEVILLE.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: John Knox, *Criticism and Faith* ($1.75); L. J. Radcliffe, *Making Prayer Real* ($3.00).

AUGUSTINE PRESS: Hubert S. Box, *The Nature of Freemasonry* (10s. 6d.).

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK: E. G. Knapp-Fisher, *The Churchman's Heritage* (6s.).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: *One Church One Faith One Lord: a syllabus of lectures for use in missionary education* (1s. 3d.).

EDITIONS DU CERF: Louis Bouyer, *Newman, sa vie, sa spiritualité* (975 frs.).

HIGHWAY PRESS: P. L. Garlick, *Man's Search for Health* (15s.).

THE LAYMAN (GORING): A. C. Toyne, *The Prayer Book and the People* (9d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Bertram Lee Woolf (transl.), *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther. Volume 1, The Basis of the Protestant Reformation* (27s. 6d.).

MOWBRAY: Various authors, *Moral Problems* (5s.); Emile Cammaerts, *The Cloud and the Silver Lining* (5s.).

NELSON: *Revised Standard Version of the Holy Bible* (Cloth, 30s.; rexine, 37s. 6d.).

OLIVER AND BOYD: W. A. Whitehouse, *Christian Faith and the Scientific Attitude* (12s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: R. M. Hare, *The Language of Morals* (7s. 6d.); L. W. Grensted, *The Psychology of Religion* (6s.).

PENGUIN CLASSICS: Thomas à Kempis, *The Imitation of Christ* (new translation by Leo Sherley-Price) (2s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Stephen Neill, *On the Ministry* (9s. 6d.).

SHEED AND WARD: Père Bruno, O.C.D. (Ed.), *Conflict and Light* (10s. 6.); Clare Boothe Luce (Ed.), *Saints for Now* (16s.); Donald Nicholl, *Recent Thought in Focus* (16s.); F. J. Sheed, *The Book of the Saviour* (18s.); Agnes De La Gorce, *St. Benedict Joseph Labre* (10s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Dent and Brearey, *The Church Advancing* (5s. 6d.); E. M. Pearson, *The Christian Faith and Way of Life* (5s. 6d.); H. W. Dobson (Ed.), *Church Teaching for the Junior Child* (5s.); Brenda Russell, *Tidings of Joy* (4s.); E. Yarovsky, *Let us be Happy* (3s.).

INDEX TO VOLUME LV

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, 1952

PAGE

Admission to Full Membership in the Methodist Church 173
ALLEN, E. L. 91
American Letters 19, 139, 255, 379
Andrewes, Lancelot 289
Are Angels Superfluous? 97
ARGYLE, A. W. 286

BAILEY, SHERWIN 47
Baptism and Church Membership among the Baptists 170
BENNETT, F. 134
Bernardino of Siena 250
BLISS, K. 208

BOOK REVIEWS (see also "Shorter Notices"):
Appasamy, *The Christian Task in Independent India* (A. Hanson) . . 306
Bailey, *The Mystery of Love and Marriage* (G. L. Russell) 190
Baillie and Marsh, *Intercommunion* (E. P. Field) 352
Baillie, *My First Eighty Years* (Editorial) 41
Barnes, *The Philosophical Predicament* (S. Curtis-Bennett) 113
Bennett and Rogers, *A Communion Book* (D. Tasker) 112
Benson, *Instructions on the Religious Life* (B. M. Oman) 110
Bliss, *The Service and Status of Women in the Churches* (S. Bailey) . . 228
Bradley, *P. T. Forsyth* (Editorial) 361
Brandon, *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church* (G. D. Kilpatrick) . 148
Brandon, *Time and Mankind* (T. R. Milford) 426
Brandreth, *Dr Lee of Lambeth* (R. D. Middleton) 229
Briggs and Frere, *A Manual of Plainsong* (Anselm Hughes) . . . 193
Bruno de J. M., *Three Mystics* (J. H. L. Waterson) 429
Buber, *Israel and Palestine* (R. J. Z. Werblowsky) 389
Buber, *Two Types of Faith* (R. G. Smith) 69
Butler, *The Originality of St Matthew* (C. K. Barrett) 106
Carrington, *The Primitive Christian Calendar* (R. P. Casey) . . . 362
Chéry, *What is the Mass?* (R. H. Fuller) 390
Cnattingius, *Bishops and Societies* (Bishop of Swansea and Brecon) . . 268
Crehan, *Father Thurston* (Editorial) 201
Dewar, *The Moral Conduct of a Christian* (W. R. F. Browning) . . . 199
Dillistone, *The Structure of the Divine Society* (F. Bennett) 196
Dodd, *Christianity and the Reconciliation of the Nations* (Bishop of Dorchester) 354
Dodd, *Gospel and Law* (Editorial) 81
Dowey, *The Knowledge of God in Calvin's Theology* (R. R. Osborn) . . 351
Edwards, *Church and Chapel* (Bishop of Dorchester) 354
Eichrodt, *Man in the O.T.* (R. S. Dean) 149
Farrer, *A Study in St Mark* (R. P. Casey) 362
Father Douglass of Behala (J. R. Peacey) 357
Flew (Ed.), *The Nature of the Church* (E. P. Field) 352
Forrester, *Christian Vocation* (W. G. Symons) 188
Galloway, *The Cosmic Christ* (W. A. Whitehouse) 67
Gorodetzky, *St Tikhon Zadonsky* (G. Every) 304
Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law* (T. Elliott) 431
Green, *The Practice of Evangelism* (W. W. S. March) 198
Green-Armytage, *John Who Saw* (E. K. Lee) 307
Guntrip, *You and Your Nerves* (F. Lake) 432
Hartill, *The Unity of God* (R. Tatlock) 473
Heard, *An Introduction to the N.T.* (L. J. Collins) 72
Heard, *Is God in History?* (T. R. Milford) 426
Henaghan, *The Secret Scripture of the Poor* (G. F. S. Gray) . . . 194
Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the N.T.* (R. H. Fuller) 390
Hodgson, *The Ecumenical Movement* (Bishop of Dorchester) . . . 354
Hunter, *Interpreting the New Testament* (C. F. D. Moule) 29

PAGE

Hynek, *The True Likeness* (J. H. L. Waterson) 153
Keay, *The Syrian Church in South India* (L. M. Schiff) 108
Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (E. C. Ratcliff) 467
Lester Smith, *Education in Great Britain* (A. J. D. Porteous) . . . 434
Lester Smith, *The Impact of Education on Society* (A. J. D. Porteous) . . 434
Lietzmann, *The Era of the Church Fathers* (H. Chadwick) 187
Lindhardt, *Grundtvig* (R. Cant) 270
Loane, *Cambridge and the Evangelical Succession* (M. M. Hennell) . . 475
MacGregor, *Christian Doubt* (Editorial) 161
McNeill, *A History of the Cure of Souls* (F. Bennett) 356
Manson, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (F. C. Synge) 30
Marcel, *Men Against Humanity* (M. Belgion) 392
Micklem, *Law and the Laws* (G. Goyder) 273
Moberly, *Responsibility* (N. H. G. Robinson) 70
Neill, *The Christian Society* (R. P. C. Hanson) 472
Nelson, *The Realm of Redemption* (W. D. Maundrell) 305
Nias, *Gorham and the Bishop of Exeter* (Bishop of Hull) 31
Nicholls, *Ecumenism and Catholicity* (Bishop of Dorchester) . . . 354
Nicodemus, *The Kingdom of the Real* (C. E. B. Cranfield) 151
Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (Editorial) 281
North, *Isaiah 40-55* (D. R. Jones) 347
Oldham, *Florence Allshorn* (G. Every) 33
Oulton, *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit* (A. M. Farrer) 107
Parker, *The Doctrine of the Knowledge of God* (R. R. Osborn) . . . 351
Pieper, *Leisure the Basis of Culture* (R. G. Smith) 358
Pittenger, *The Christian Sacrifice* (D. Webster) 308
Quin, *The Ten Commandments* (H. Cunliffe-Jones) 266
Rawlinson, *The Church of South India* (L. M. Schiff) 108
Reichelt, *Religion in Chinese Garment* (A. F. Lutley) 195
Religious of C.S.M.V., *They Shall be my People* (P. J. Lamb) . . . 230
Richardson and Schweitzer, *Biblical Authority for To-day* (R. P. C. Hanson) 186
Rigg, *The Fourth Gospel and its Message for To-day* (J. N. Sanders) . . 350
Robinson, *The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology* (F. C. Synge) . . 388
Robinson, *The Claim of Morality* (W. R. Forrester) 425
Rowley, *Submission in Suffering* (G. F. S. Gray) 194
Rowley, *The Servant of the Lord* (D. R. Jones) 347
Schmauch (Ed.), *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer* (R. H. Fuller) . . . 226
Snow, *Patrick Forbes* (H. R. T. Brandreth) 267
Spinks, etc., *Religion in Britain since 1900* (W. Nicholls) 271
Stevenson, *Max Joseph Metzger* (W. R. F. Browning) 437
Taylor, *The Gospel according to St Mark* (R. P. Casey) 362
Teresia de Spiritu Sancto, *Edith Stein* (W. R. F. Browning) . . . 437
Thompson, *Into All Lands* (C. K. Sansbury) 152
Trimingham, *Islam in Ethiopia* (D. A. Brown) 435
van de Pol, *The Christian Dilemma* (L. Hodgson) 471
Westwood, *Society and the Homosexual* (S. Bailey) 476
Williams, *Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (H. Burnaby) . . . 349
Wood, *English Casuistical Divinity* (H. R. McAdoo) 424
Zander, *Vision and Action* (B. Drewery) 303

Bonnell, James 342
Bouyer, L. 87
Brooks, Phillips 42
Burleigh, J. H. S. 338
Butler, Joseph 213

Casey, R. P. 362
Christian Apologetics 282
Christian Initiation in Congregational Churches 166
Christian Optimism 407
Christian Unity, Some Reflections on 324

PAGE

Church and State 162
COLLIER, K. G. 216
Contemplatives in a Secularized World 127
Correspondence 27, 66, 101, 147, 184, 266, 319, 387, 423, 465
COURATIN, A. H. 458
COUTTS, F. L. 176

DAMMERS, A. H. 454
Darkness of the Cosmic Sea, The 122
Dead Sea Scrolls, The 321
Dean and the Welfare State, A 241
Difficult Cousins 134
DOBBS, G. 370, 417
Dodwell and the Apostolic Succession 412
DONOVAN, M. 421
"*Down Peacock's Feathers*" 26, 101
DURHAM, BISHOP OF (A. T. P. WILLIAMS) 162

EDINBURGH, BISHOP OF 324
"*English Life and Leisure*", *Reflections upon* 10
Estrangement from Man 299
EVERY, G. 83, 412

Frank, Mark 15

GIBBARD, S. M. 127
GRAYSTON, K. 122
Great Preachers 15, 42, 87, 143, 178, 213, 250, 289, 338, 382
GUNDRY, D. W. 178

HANSON, R. P. C. 10
HARDING, D. E. 97
HARDY, E. R. 255
Heavenly Session of Christ, The 286, 387
Historical Element in the Gospel, The 221
Historic Episcopate, The 83, 184
HUXTABLE, J. 166
Justin Martyr and Confirmation 458

KEAN, C. D. 379
KELLEY, A. D. 19
Knox, John 143

Latimer 382
LEWIS, H. D. 221
Lightfoot, Savage and Eden 294
Lund, 1952 402

MCADOO, H. R. 342
MACKINNON, D. M. 407
MACPHERSON, T. 299
Male and Female 208, 423
Marcel, Philosophy of M. Gabriel 59
Mark's Gospel, St 362
MASCALL, E. L. 330
MATTHEWS, W. R. 213
MAY, G. L. 15
MONTIZAMBERT, E. 139

NELSON, R. 460
Newman, J. H. 87
NICHOLLS, W. 402

PAGE

OWST, G. R. 250

Paley 178
Parish and People 460
Parish Priest as Preacher 421
Pastoral Work with Alcoholics 245
PAWLEY, B. C. 2
PAYNE, E. A. 170
PEACOCK, H. H. E. 245
Philosophy and the Bible in K. Jaspers 91
PITTENGER, W. N. 282

READ, D. H. C. 143
REARDON, B. M. G. 59
Religion in Jane Austen's Novels 260
"Rigorists", Concerning 2, 101, 147
ROBINSON, J. A. T. 202
ROBINSON, W. 52

Sacraments and Eschatology 52
St Augustine 338
St Thomas's Eucharistic Theology 330
SCARLETT, BISHOP 42
Sexual Inversion, The Problem of 28, 47
Shorter Notices 34, 73, 114, 155, 231, 274, 309, 393, 438, 478
Soldiership in the Salvation Army 176
SPIVEY, R. V. 173
Studies in Texts 25
Suffering, Contemporary Interpretation of 216
SYNGE, F. C. 25

Tamar and Mrs Thomas 454
Tax, The Just 370, 417
TAYLOR, F. J. 382
Theological College in a Changing World, The 202, 319
THOMAS, D. WINTON 321
TUCKER, A. E. H. 260

VIDLER, A. R. 441

Welfare State from a Christian Point of View, The 441
WELSBY, P. A. 289
What is meant by Succession? 376
WILSON, R. 294
WOODHOUSE, H. F. 376

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher